

So far as the Money Bill is concerned, the procedure is laid down in article 109 and not 117. Under article 117, a financial Bill cannot be introduced in that House. But regarding the further stages, that House is equally competent to pass the Bill. Even with reference to a Joint Committee, the other House can scan it clause by clause, amend or alter or throw out the Bill. It has to come back to us and then there will have to be a joint session. Shall we go on until a joint session is convened? We are not bound by that advice. In those circumstances, what is the harm? The hon. Members are evidently under the impression that this is a Money Bill and not a financial Bill. This is a financial Bill. In those circumstances, in all these stages which have to be gone through except in the introduction of the Bill, the other House is equally competent. I am one with the hon. Members in safeguarding the interests of the House and I am bound to do so. But I think that this is only a financial Bill. So far as the legal point is concerned—even from the point of view of propriety, there is nothing wrong in referring it to a Joint Committee.

Shri S. S. More : In view of what you have stated that this is a financial Bill and not a Money Bill, may I bring to your notice that this particular proviso refers to Money Bills under article 110? In that case, the House need not suspend it.

Mr. Speaker : The hon. Member ignores article 117. Article 117(i) refers to this provision—(a) to (f) in sub-clause (i) of article 110. They are common to both the financial Bill and the Money Bill. In the case of Money Bills, they are exclusive. That is all. Nothing else. But here, this provision is allowed to dominate so far as financial Bill is concerned. Many other things can be introduced. Therefore, the hon. Member has not evidently looked into that provision of article 117(i). (*Interruptions.*) Anyhow, I differ from him. I will now put the motion.

The question is:

“That the first proviso to Rule 92 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the motion for

reference of the States Reorganisation Bill to a Joint Committee be suspended.”

The motion was adopted.

STATES REORGANISATION BILL.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant) : I beg to move* :

“That the Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the States of India and for matters connected therewith be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 Members, 30 from this House, namely, Shri U. Srinivasa Malliah, Shri H. V. Pataskar, Shri A. M. Thomas, Shri R. Venkataraman, Sri S. R. Rane, Shri B. G. Mehta, Shri Basanta Kumar Das, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, Shri V. N. Tivary, Shri Dev Kanta Borooah, Shri S. Nijalingappa, Shri S. K. Patil, Shri Shriman Narayan, Shri G. S. Altekar, Shri G. B. Khedkar, Shri Radha Charan Sharma, Shri Gurumukh Singh Musafir, Shri Ram Pratap Garg, Shri Bhawanji A. Khimji, Shri P. Ramaswamy, Shri B. N. Datar, Shri Anandchand, Shri Frank Anthony, Shri P. T. Punnoose, Shri K. K. Basu, Shri J. B. Kripalani, Shri Asoka Mehta, Shri Sarangadhar Das, Shri N. C. Chatterji and Shri Jaipal Singh; and fifteen Members from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of Members of the Joint Committee ;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the 14th May, 1956 ;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

names of Members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee".

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): May I again seek light from you?

Mr. Speaker: No light now. I will give him an opportunity.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Sir, I was running the serious risk of being throttled at the very outset. By your ruling, I have now the opportunity of saying a few words with regard to the motion which I made at the outset.

I do not intend to inflict any long speech. If necessary, I shall speak, more fully perhaps, when the debate comes to a close. The subject matter of this Bill has been before the country for more than six months. The report of the SRC was published on the 10th of October last and since that date, it has been the subject of discussion not only in all the legislatures and in the Parliament but also outside. The Press has dealt with the proposals that were made by the S.R.C. fully and closely and the recommendations were also examined, supported or opposed at innumerable meetings. The matter has really been talked about so much that one sometimes feels that it has perhaps become somewhat stale. But, still it deals with questions of more than ordinary importance and it is necessary to consider afresh and weigh the arguments for and against the proposals that have been made previously or that appear in the present form in the Bill.

We, in this House, had the opportunity of taking part in a grand debate which came to an end on the 23rd December last, just four months ago. We have since had the benefit of going through the reports of the proceedings that have been held in the various State Legislatures during the last three weeks. The debate in Parliament was of a unique type. Never before had so much of time been given to the discussion of any report and never before had so many hon. Members taken part in such a discussion. After the matter had been thoroughly thrashed out in and outside the Parliament, the Central Government expressed its views on the points that were at issue or under consideration on the 16th of January last.

The announcement then made covered most of the proposals that are embodied in this Bill. Only two or

three matters were left over; those relating to the State of Punjab, the Bellary talukas or district of Karnatak at present, and also the unification or otherwise of Telengana with Andhra. These were the three questions that were then left over.

I am glad to inform the House, as Hon. Members may be knowing, that all these outstanding matters have been since settled with the general agreement of all parties concerned. The representatives of the people in Andhra and Telengana have agreed to have a unitary or unified State, and the other matter about Punjab, which had been a vexed question, more or less of a chronic type for a very long period, has also been settled to the satisfaction of the bulk of the people living in the Punjab.

An Hon. Member: No.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Well, there was an occasion when Bernard Shaw was listening to the performance relating to one of his plays. All people outside expressed their appreciation and applause was given by the entire audience. One of them booed and said: "I do not agree". Mr. Shaw, who happened to be there, said: "You and I are the only two persons to agree with us, but all others disagree". That is the case here too.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): Does the Minister agree with him?

Pandit G. B. Pant: So, the outstanding problems relating to the Punjab have also been settled.

With the unification of the States of Telengana and Andhra, the problem of Bellary became relatively simple and an agreement was reached of a general character. The Commission had suggested the transfer of Bellary or some of its talukas to Andhra for the protection of the Tungabhadra Project. The Central Government has received an assurance from the Government of Mysore and have taken it upon themselves to see to it that the Tungabhadra Project is carried out speedily, that it is maintained in proper order; that the benefits that could accrue from it are fully enjoyed by the people of Andhra and that nobody will in any way interfere with such enjoyment.

So these problems have been settled.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): Have the Andhra Government agreed to this proposition?

Pandit G. B. Pant: They would not like to say that they have agreed, but I can count upon their support.

Sir, then there was only one small tehsil which was transferred to Rajasthan from the Punjab, according to the announcement made on 16th January—the tehsil of Loharu—but the people of Loharu wanted it to be retained in the Punjab. So, again, with the consent of all concerned, the tehsil of Loharu is now to continue in the Punjab and it is not going to be transferred to Rajasthan.

Shri S. S. More: May I know whether all these documents, which record the consent of all parties concerned, will be circulated to Members of Parliament or at least to the Members of the Select Committee?

Pandit G. B. Pant: Wherever any statement will be questioned, efforts will be made to remove the doubts of those who question the statements.

Shri S. S. More: Sir, that is no reply though it is a compliment. My seeking is. . . .

Mr. Speaker: That is all the reply. How can I force any hon. Minister to give a reply? He says, whenever any doubt is raised, to the satisfaction of the Member or Members who have raised doubts, the passages, if necessary, will be forwarded to them.

Shri S. S. More: I am only raising the question of placing in the possession of the House all the relevant information so that the House can come to an independent conclusion; that is, I fight for the right of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Very good.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Well, Sir, I do not dispute the right of the House or of any individual Member to seek enlightenment regarding any matter whatsoever. . . .

Shri S. S. More: Yes.

Pandit G. B. Pant: . . . and I shall try to remove the darkness from every corner or quarter where it may happen to be.

2—93 Lok Sabha.

Then, after the announcement had been made on the 16th of January, the matter was further examined and, as I said, the outstanding questions were settled in a very satisfactory way. Then, on the 16th of March, the Bill that was framed on the basis of the conclusions reached by the Government previously was placed on the Table of the House and it was referred to all the State Legislatures under article 3 of the Constitution. Though under the law, only 12 out of the A and B States were affected by the Bill and they alone had the right of reference to them under article 3, we referred the Bill not only to those 12, but also to 5 other A and B States, all the Part C States and also to Tripura, Manipur and Kutch which had only electoral colleges.

1 P.M.

The provisions contained in the Bill so far as reorganisation of States and territorial adjustments are concerned, affect only twelve of the States. As hon. Members are aware, the States of Assam, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Bengal and Bihar are not touched by the provisions for the readjustment of boundaries. About Bengal and Bihar, as I stated previously, matters are under consideration and if any arrangement is voluntarily reached. . . .

Shri K. K. Basu: With the consent of the people, I suppose.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I hope so. Yes, 'people' being not tantamount to members of any particular party. I hope that when two States reach an agreement, then a Bill will have to be introduced concerning those States. So we have to confine ourselves to the twelve States.

Out of the twelve States which are affected by the Bill, eleven have communicated their views. The Bill was discussed in everyone of these eleven and they might be deemed to be in general agreement except in one particular case with regard to one particular matter. That does not, however, mean that every item in the Bill has been accepted indiscriminately by everyone. They have analysed and examined the provisions of the Bill, a number of amendments were moved in the legislatures and about a hundred of them—the exact number being ninety-seven—were accepted. Of these ninety-seven, very few are of major importance. Three may be said to be so.

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

The State of Hyderabad suggested by a narrow majority that Bombay and Maharashtra should form one State.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): The Congress Members did not vote; otherwise, the majority would have been considerable.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Perhaps, and if they had voted against, it may have been defeated!

There was another proposal too which was suggested in the Bombay Legislature: that the States of Gujarat, Maharashtra and Bombay should not have a common High Court, but that each of these units should have a separate High Court. I understand that the High Court in Bombay itself holds a different view. But whatever it be, that was one of the amendments suggested. Some other amendments were also proposed, suggesting an increase in the number of members of the Legislatures for some of these States. Well, I think the more the merrier. So, if a larger number is considered to be necessary, we will have occasion to set up a larger number of candidates and we will have an opportunity of making selection of good men for good jobs. But that has to be examined and then decisions will have to be taken.

Then there were certain proposals for the setting up of upper houses in some States, such as Andhra; about Maharashtra there were suggestions from certain quarters that Maharashtra State also should have an upper house. But all these questions will have to be considered by the Joint Committee. The Bill makes provision not only for the readjustment of boundaries but also for other matters.

A number of new States are being set up. The State of Madhya Pradesh, which will perhaps be the biggest in area hereafter, is to be formed according to the provisions of this Bill. Telangana and Andhra will form another big State. The legislatures both of Telangana and Andhra have suggested that the name of the new State might be Andhra Desa, instead of Andhra-Telangana.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Is it Andhra Desa or Andhra Pradesh?

Pandit G. B. Pant: Perhaps, the hon. Member is right.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I would like to know from the Home Minister.

Pandit G. B. Pant: When he reminds me I should accept his correction.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I just wanted to know what exactly is the opinion given to the Home Minister and what he proposes to do.

Pandit G. B. Pant: It is either 'Desh' or 'Pradesh'; but it is not 'Pardesh'!

Then the Bill makes also other proposals which are essential. The members of the existing legislatures belonging to the parts which are transferred to other States will now carry their membership to the States to which their constituencies are transferred. They will not cease to be members; so, that is a matter of gratification and also relief to those who would otherwise have lost their place in the legislatures. Some of these States such as Coorg, with a population of only two lakhs have a disproportionate number of members in the legislature. Perhaps, they have one for a thousand. But for the present we are not suggesting any curtailment in number. We have adopted the uniform rule that all existing members will continue to be members of the new States till the next General Elections.

Then the new great State of Maharashtra will be set up with Vidharba, Marathwada and the Marathi-speaking districts of Bombay State. It will be a big State—perhaps, second or third among the States of India. Then we will have the new State of Gujarat consisting of Saurashtra and other districts which form part of the Bombay State. We will have the big State of Mysore which will now almost be double, not only in area, but also perhaps in numbers. It will consist of Mysore and of the Kannada-speaking districts of Hyderabad and of Bombay State. So, that too will be a big State.

Travancore-Cochin will now assume the name of Kerala, and some of the taluks in the South over which there was considerable acute and sharp controversy for a pretty long period will now be transferred to Tamilnad, while Malabar will be transferred from Madras to Kerala. I regret that we have got no legislature in Kerala today. The circumstances in which the step which involved

the replacement of the legislature by the President's rule was taken, the hon. Members are acquainted with. But we nevertheless, have the full information about the views of the Travancore-Cochin legislature. The matter was discussed in the legislature of Travancore-Cochin for four days—from 21st to 24th November, 1955—and all questions concerning that State were fully discussed. So we have with us the views, opinions and suggestions of every one of the 12 States affected by this Bill.

There is provision also for the conduct of business. It is expected and it was our original programme that the new States may be set up on the 1st of October. However, the fulfilment of this wish will depend on the co-operation of the hon. Members of this House. I am grateful to them for the way they have dealt with this very controversial topic so far. It is to be regretted that there were some unfortunate incidents in the early stages but that phase is gone. I know that there is still anguish in some hearts. We wish we could soothe and cure them and remove any such feelings. We have throughout been anxious to do so and have revised our decisions from time to time, but unfortunately we have not succeeded.

Then, for the conduct of business, it is necessary that these States should have their finances when they come into existence. So, the present Governors and Rajpramukhs will certify the expenditure that will be incurred by the new States during the first three months after their coming into existence. The Joint Committee might consider whether this period of three months is adequate or whether it can be extended to six months, so that the whole of the financial year can be covered. There will be other points also which will have to be considered by the Joint Committee.

The Bill also makes provision for the allotment of funds for the division of assets and liabilities. The general principle that has been followed is briefly and succinctly this: that so far as land and things such as dues on lands are concerned, the State to which the area is transferred will have the benefit of them without having to pay any compensation to anybody. So far as cash and other assets, loans, and advances debts due, etc., are concerned, these will have to be taken into account. The Bill also provides that the debts that are due to the State of Bombay or of Hyderabad

will be taken over by the Centre so that the successor States may not be burdened with heavy liabilities at the very outset. The new State will have to bear the responsibility for these debts according to the general principle which has been laid down.

Provision has also been made for the protection of works, whether relating to irrigation, electricity or the like. There is also some safeguard for ensuring the proper appropriation and application of the funds provided for development purposes for the benefit of the areas for which they are intended. Other provisions have also been made so that the persons living in the territories which are being transferred to other areas may have the benefit of institutions such as medical, agriculture, veterinary colleges and the like. They should not be put to any difficulty immediately after the transfer of certain areas to other States. So far as care could be taken to see that the new States were not handicapped at the very outset, proper safeguards have been provided, and provision has been made in the Bill.

I might also say that the financial allotments to be made, whether out of the excise pool or the income-tax pool, to the new States has also been taken into consideration and the schedule gives the shares that will fall to the lot of the new States. That, in a way, gives in a nutshell the contents of this Bill.

I do not think that I should dwell in greater detail on the provisions of the Bill. The whole matter will go to the Joint Committee and all the suggestions that will be made there will be given full consideration, I hope, by the Committee, and the Government. An attempt has been made to have a strong and representative Committee for dealing with the proposals that are contained in the Bill. I do not know if it is necessary for me to remind hon. Members of the duty that each one of us owes to the country while we deal with matters which concern the respective States. The questions with which the Joint Committee will have to deal and those which will still come for consideration in this House have in the past engendered heat and passion in some places and in certain places certain unfortunate incidents also took place. But we all, I believe, have learnt a lesson. I still feel perplexed when I hear that some sort of demonstrations—or whatever other word you might like to use—are still being

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

carried in certain places by the name of satyagraha. Ours is a democratic country. We have been discussing these matters everywhere. There has been free scope for the expression of views. Every section of opinion has had full opportunities to help those who will have to decide these matters finally with their own assessment of the situation and their own comments or criticisms. So, we should stick to that method. Perhaps the greatest need of the hour is to concentrate on the restoration of good feeling and the restoration not only of calm and tranquility, but of mutual trust and confidence. The feeling of neighbourly comradeship and mutual reliance on each other is what we need, so that wherever any improvements are to be made, thought might be given to them. But, let us then be prepared to face the future with faith and with hope.

The new second Five Year Plan is to be launched shortly. We are hearing grumblings and murmurings from places which are not very far removed from us. I was reading in the papers about a certain manifesto in which the word "jihad" has been used. Our country has acquired a certain stature in the eyes of the world. So, let us solve our problems in a useful and becoming manner, so that we might devote our energies to constructive channels and not only raise this great and ancient land to its full stature and the status which it deserves to occupy in the comity of nations, but also create such surroundings, foster such sentiments, develop such an atmosphere and environment in which every citizen may rise to his full height and everyone may feel the pride and the glory of being a citizen of this great country of India.

Shri S. S. More : Before you put the motion to the House, may I raise a point of order, with your permission? My submission is that in this Bill certain territories are to be classified as Union Territories. My submission is that we are bound by the Constitution, though we are sovereign within the limits of the Constitution. The Constitution, Article 3, in particular, gives this Parliament power to alter the boundaries of existing States or even to create new States and non-State territory which has been recognised by the Constitution is Part D—Andaman and Nicobar Islands. Now, some of the States like Bombay and some of the small islands are placed in the category of Union Territories in

this Bill. There is no such category under the present Constitution, though I do recognise that in the Constitution Amendment Bill, an attempt has been made to modify the Schedule and create a different variety of territory, which is to be recognised as Union Territory. So, till that part of the Constitution is accepted by the House, it is not right to make provision for such a territory.

Sir, I rely upon two previous rulings given by yourself during the Fourth Session. At page 10 of this brochure, *Decisions from the Chair*, there is ruling No. 5:

Mr. Speaker : What is the year?

Shri S. S. More : This refers to the Fourth Session, 3rd August to 18th September, 1953. There was a Criminal Law Amendment Bill in which there was a clause to insert a new section; in another Bill which was also dependent on it, there was a reference to that section I am quoting from page 11. The Deputy Speaker observed as follows :

"It has been brought to my notice by Mr. Ramaswamy that the inclusion of section 165A here is a little too premature. It is only just now that this House passed and made 165A a substantive offence. The Council of States has yet to pass it; it has to receive the assent of the President; then alone will it become law. Till then I am afraid this Bill has to stand over."

In accepting this point of order, you expressed yourself very strongly. The Deputy-Speaker observed as follows :

"After all, it is no good assuming that this will be accepted by the Council of States. Are we to pass legislation which will become infructuous? The President may not give assent to it—then there will not be section 165A."

When we were discussing the Estate Duty Bill, under clause 30 of that Bill, it was authorised that Parliament should pass another law for the purpose of deciding the rates. Simultaneously when the Estate Duty Bill was under the consideration of the House a Bill purporting to be authorised by this section was introduced in this House and I had the misfortune to raise a point of order to seek a clarification from you. You said that as long as that section did not become part of an enactment validly passed, its authority could not be utilised for

the purpose of introducing another Bill. You also said that though the two Bills could be considered to have been introduced simultaneously, the other Bill would not be attended to unless this particular Bill was passed. This is quoted as decision No. 6 in the same brochure.

The Constitution Amendment Bill, if passed by this House, if assented to by the Council of States and if assented to by the President, becomes part of the Constitution. Only when it becomes part of the Constitution, Union Territories will be a valid classification. Till then a measure which is trying to rely by way of anticipation of passing of such a measure will not be proper. I am raising this as a technical objection, though as a practical reality, I do understand that this Bill will go through. But, here we are concerned with our following as meticulously as possible the constitutional provisions and limitations that we have set on ourselves. I would rather say that the Government should give priority to that Bill, get it passed by an enactment, keep it on our statute-book and then under the authority of that amended Constitution—I say amended Constitution and not an introduced Bill—we can proceed further and see whether we want to create new States and some territories which do not have the necessary characteristics of States. This question of priority is a very important question. I want to make it clear that I have not raised this point for the purpose of putting hurdles in the way of the Government. I do realise the necessity of the expeditious disposal of this particular measure. But, if the Constitution raises certain objections, we must try to remove those objections. It is no use leading for speed when the Constitution is coming in our way to stop our speed or progress. I rely on the two previous decisions which you have given. We may very well accept this principle. Let the Constitution Amendment Bill be taken first. Let us make an Act, under the authority of which this House will be competent to create a territory like the Union territory. These are my submissions.

Mr. Speaker : The hon. Minister.

Pandit G. B. Pant : I must confess that I have not been able to follow the objection that has been raised by Shri More.

Shri S. S. More : That is my fault, I know.

Pandit G. B. Pant : I have not been able to follow him; it may be my fault, but the fact remains that you and I have not been able to understand each other. That fact is there.

Shri S. S. More : That is why we are sitting on the Opposition.

Pandit G. B. Pant : But that is not the only thing. Still, your heart may be here. (Interruptions.)

There is a Bill which I have introduced, which has now been placed on the Table of the House, with regard to which a motion of reference to a Joint Committee has been made. If there is any provision in it which this House does not like to approve, it can throw that out. If the Joint Committee thinks that certain clauses should not be adopted, the Joint Committee will take decisions to that effect. But, it is accepted by Shri S. S. More that certain provisions had to be made in the Constitution Amendment Bill. They could not be made in this Bill. We have made such provisions in this Bill as could find a place here. We have made provisions which are more or less a counterpart of these, in the other Bill. We placed both of them on the Table here on one and the same date. Immediately after this Bill has been referred to a Joint Committee, I propose to make a motion for reference of that Bill to a Joint Committee. I do not know what other method can be feasible or possible. I do not see what I am expected to do in this matter.

Mr. Speaker : I have heard both sides. I shall consider this matter. Discussion may go on. I will put the motion formally to the House.

Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan (Dindigul) : What has happened to my amendment?

Pandit G. B. Pant : May I, Sir, with your permission...

Mr. Speaker : The hon. Member has been for long a Member of Parliament. After the motion is put, the hon. Member may move the amendment unless the amendment is moved by the Government itself.

Pandit G. B. Pant : I am taking the earliest moment to adopt your amendment as mine. I suggest....

Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan : I have made changes in the names.

Pandit G. B. Pant : I beg to move :

That in the motion—

(i) for "consisting of 45 members; 30 from this House and 15 members from Rajya Sabha" substitute

"consisting of 51 members; 34 from this House and 17 members from Rajya Sabha"; and

(ii) after serial No. 30, add—

- "31 Dr. Lanka Sundaram
32. Shri Tek Chand
33. Dr. N. M. Jaisoorya
34. Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan".

Mr. Speaker : I will place before the House the motion as amended.

Motion moved :

"That the Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the States of India and for matters connected therewith be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 51 members, 34 from this House, namely, Shri U. Srinivasa Malliah, Shri H. V. Pataskar, Shri A. M. Thomas, Shri R. Venkataraman, Shri S. R. Rane, Shri B. G. Mehta, Shri Basanta Kumar Das, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, Shri V. N. Tivary, Shri Dev Kanta Borooah, Shri S. Nijalingappa, Shri S. K. Patil, Shri Shriman Narayan, Shri G. S. Altekar, Shri G. B. Khedkar, Shri Radha Charan Sharma, Shri Gurmukh Singh Musafir, Shri Ram Pratap Garg, Shri Bhawanji A. Khimji, Shri P. Ramaswamy, Shri B. N. Datar, Shri Anandchand, Shri Frank Anthony, Shri P. T. Punnoose, Shri K. K. Basu, Shri J. B. Kripalani, Shri Asoka Mehta, Shri Sarangadhar Das, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, Shri Jaipal Singh, Dr. Lanka Sundaram, Shri Tek Chand, Dr. N. M. Jaisoorya, and Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan and 17 members from Rajya Sabha ;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the 14th May, 1956;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will

apply such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

Shri Basappa : In the list read out by the Home Minister, the name of Shri Nijalingappa was there. I want to know whether it is there or not.

Mr. Speaker : Shri Nijalingappa's is also there. This motion including Shri Nijalingappa's name is before the House.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North East): Mr. Speaker, thanks to technicality and the Government's predilection for putting its foot into it, the atmosphere of today's debate has been somewhat disturbed already. But, seldom have we in this House been called upon to consider legislation of similar moment. This is legislation of a sort for which our people have hungered and thirsted. But, this Bill comes before us with a kind of strange and characteristic irony, for Government has done its best to make a mess where there need not have been one and certain incredibly graceless, perverse, anti-people acts of omission and commission have spoiled largely a measure which everybody was only too ready and willing to welcome. Perhaps some of the damage may, if Government relents, be repaired in the Joint Committee to which this Bill is to be referred. But, as things stand today, much of the wrong done to our people by the Government's handling of this measure will not, I fear, be rectified.

I heard the Home Minister telling us in his opening speech that in regard to certain matters, he is going to take decisions in conformity with the wishes of the people. I take it, even though he did not positively aver it in that way, that that was his intention. Because, when, in regard to the question of the so-called union or merger or amalgamation—whatever way you call it, the stink is the same—of West Bengal and Bihar—amalgamation is the expression used by the Minister in the Statement of Objects and reasons—a question was asked from this side of the House if the wishes of the people were going to be consulted in that matter, the Home

Minister answered yes, but the people are not tantamount to members of a particular party. I shall deal with this matter in some detail a little later. But I do wish to pin the Home Minister down to this formulation. Everybody would grant that people does not mean members or supporters of a particular political party whether it is the Congress Party or any other Party. But, if the wishes of the people are really to be consulted in regard to the question of what the Home Minister calls the amalgamation of Bihar and West Bengal, then, surely this suggestion should be dropped at once without ceremony and an announcement to that effect should be made by the Home Minister straightaway.

I am inclined to be very charitable to the Home Minister and I am prepared to concede that he is, like the Prime Minister, certainly wedded to truth and non-violence. But, I suppose, like many wedded couples, they often live apart. As far as this is concerned, what he has said has nothing to do either with truth or with any other principles which are so often paraded. The Home Minister's Statement of Objects and Reasons is a very politely expressed study in political guide. As is the fashion with people in power today, the principles of linguistic redistribution of States, which at one time was zealously advocated as a primary factor, is obliquely and parenthetically referred to only to be dismissed in favour of what is called a more rational basis of reorganisation. This so-called rational basis has led him to pitfalls which are so numerous in this Bill. It has been said over and over again, but it bears re-telling that right up to their being pitchforked in 1947 into positions of power, and even up to the time of the last general elections, the Congress made no secret of its support to the linguistic principle.

In 1928, the Nehru report averred that the main considerations in the matter of redistribution of provinces must necessarily be the wishes of the people and the linguistic unity of the area concerned. The point cannot be put better than by quoting the words of the report itself, this presumably ancient document, which says:

"A democracy must be well-informed and must be able to understand and follow public affairs in order to take an effective part in them. Hence it becomes

most desirable for provinces to be regrouped on a linguistic basis. Language, as a rule, corresponds to a special variety of culture, tradition and literature. In a linguistic area, all these factors will help the general progress of the province."

Nearly three decades have passed since that report, but its formulation on this point remains indubitably valid. Those who prate very importantly today and talk of what they choose to call the evils of linguism, are slanderers of our people.

India is, as our Constitution says, a Union of States, not conflicting or warring States which have come together, which have agreed to some terms, but States firmly and fundamentally akin, their unity shining in despite of certain diversities, and their culture a beautiful and multi-coloured mosaic, which if you break a piece here or crack and scratch a piece there, will damage it dreadfully. The unity of India, and our solidarity that is with our people a kind of categorical imperative. That is the first charge on our patriotism. But that unity will be consolidated and safeguarded as the apple of our eye, when the people are assured that except when insuperable conditions and difficulties supervene, except in those circumstances, linguistic States will be set up as a matter of course. Now, in so far as this Bill before us helps this process, it is welcome. But in so far as it hinders, it should be changed, and I hope that in the Joint Committee, some drastic alterations are made.

There is no hesitation on my part to welcome the abolition of the office of Rajpramukh, or the removal of the distinction between Part A, Part B and Part C States. We certainly welcome the formation of States like Kerala and Mysore, and the other linguistic States that are coming into being. Still, I wish here to put in a caveat. Why call it Mysore? Why not Karnatak? Why again, in the case of Andhra call it Andhra Telangana? Why not call it simply Andhra? If Vishalandhra smacks of something like chauvinism—it does not perhaps really, but if it does, if it is suspected to be so—why not merely call it Andhra? Again in the case of Madras State, the city of Madras is there. But why not call the State the Tamil Nad? There is no reason for us to be shame-faced about it, except on the supposition that we do not like the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

linguistic principle. We may like it; our people may want us to like it, but the administration requires that we rather keep mum about the linguistic principle.

In regard to the zonal councils, which have been sought to be set up, I feel that this is a matter which should be gone into very critically by the Joint Committee. The establishment of zonal councils by itself cannot be a way out of the difficulties of tackling common problems or even mutual disputes between States. For example, in spite of the fact that Punjab and Delhi are in one zonal council, namely the Northern Council, whereas the UP is in the Central zone, there are perhaps more problems to be solved, and common interests to be pursued, between Punjab, Delhi and Uttar Pradesh than between Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir, or say, Rajasthan and Himachal Pradesh in the same zone. Similarly, there are perhaps more common problems between Andhra, Maharashtra and Karnataka than between Andhra and Kerala or Tamil Nad. Therefore, the establishment of these zonal councils is not the real guarantee for the speedy settlement of mutual problems or disputes.

A solution for that lies in an integrated approach to the question of economic development of India. That is why my feeling is that the zonal councils can be permitted, provided their constitution is changed, provided a democratic character is injected into these councils, and at the same time, the zonal councils should have only social planning and economic planning to think about. Otherwise, we feel that unless we change the composition of these zonal councils in a democratic direction, and unless we make it certain that decisions will not be taken by majority vote, but that it would be a consultative apparatus which would lead to an understanding of what ought to be done, these zonal councils might be the thin end of the wedge for the introduction of certain administrative units which may be, Govt. have in mind. That is why perhaps Government are so very much against the idea of linguistic States. In regard to this, I find that in the Madras Legislative Assembly, an hon. Minister initiating the debate on the Bill spoke on the zonal councils in these terms. He said :

"If these zonal councils function properly, then we may perhaps later on assess the value of these

councils and examine whether further powers should be given, and if so, what further steps should be taken."

Therefore, the danger of efforts being made to transform the zonal councils in to mergers through the back-door should be spotlighted, and that should be considered very carefully by the Joint Committee. I hope that if that consideration is made, the whole character of the zonal councils would be changed in the right kind of direction.

Now, I have no time to refer to the many points of omission and of commission, which Government have done mischievously in regard to this Bill, but leaving the case of Bombay to be argued by people who know it very much better than I do, I would merely say that the demand for the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra is absolutely without a doubt a genuine, popular, democratic demand, and that the provision in regard to Bombay as formulated in this Bill can have only one objective, and that is to keep this as commercial capital of India, as some people have taken to describe it. These elements have got to be pandered to very carefully by the Congress, particularly on the eve of the general election, when specially the present-day Chief Minister of the Bombay State is treasurer of the Congress Party, with responsibilities which appear to be perhaps somewhat overwhelming in view of the general elections to come.

This demand of the people regarding the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra has been resisted in a most thoughtless fashion by Government, and Bombay, even now, bleeds in silent agony. But I leave Bombay's case to be argued by those who are more capable of doing so. I only want to say that in regard to Bombay, justice has not been done at all. On the contrary, there is a kind of machination behind whatever is suggested about the future of Bombay.

Now, I shall refer to one other important matter. I am sure that the time at my disposal will not be adequate to discuss with any kind of adequacy the very many points which occur to me at the moment, but I shall confine myself to the question of the States in the north-east of India, particularly West Bengal, Bihar and Orissa.

I do not understand why the case of Orissa has been completely forgotten, overborne and discarded, however you

wish to put it. Is it only because the people of Orissa are poor? But, at the same time, they have shown their spirit, they have shown that in spite of the power and pomp of the Congress Party, there is in that State a movement which is germinating into a tremendous power. But the claims of Orissa in regard to areas like Saraikella and Kharswan have simply been ignored altogether.

Then again, in regard to the questions pending between West Bengal and Bihar, the whole story is so sordid that some kind of explanation has to come from Government in regard to it. Between West Bengal and Bihar, there were certain controversies—right or wrong is a different proposition. We had gone over that matter once before, and I do not want to repeat myself. But as far as the States Reorganisation Commission was concerned, it reached certain conclusions; right or wrong, it reached those conclusions. Some of us thought they were wrong because they had not taken into consideration certain other genuine demands of West Bengal. Then after that, we got the Government's decision on the States Reorganisation Commission's Report. That decision was even worse because it truncated the award which was made by the Commission. But in any case, the Government made a certain announcement about the impending transfer of certain areas from Bihar to West Bengal. And suddenly, from out of the blue, there comes a notion of the merger between the two States. After that, as I said earlier, it has been described as a union, and then the Home Minister says it is going to be an amalgamation. But, more or less, they amount to the same thing.

In the draft proposals regarding the Bill which were circulated by Government a month ago, there is a preface, and in that preface, it is said:

"that in view of the proposals for the union of the two States, which is now under active consideration, no provision has been made in the draft Bill in regard to territorial adjustments between the States of Bihar and West Bengal. A separate Bill will be introduced in due course to implement the decision which may be taken about these States".

The Home Minister has repeated this same thing again. But what we feel is this: for sometime now, there has been carried on in the country a propaganda

through a servile Press that a very large section of the people in West Bengal are in favour of the union. That is completely false; that is so much abracadabra. At the moment, there is going on in Calcutta, a campaign for the election to this House, in the place of the late lamented Shri Meghnad Saha. I was there in Calcutta till only the other day and I can say, and I can challenge the Home Minister to wait for a few days and to find out how the people vote, how the people in a constituency where nearly 40 per cent. of the electors are non-Bengalis, vote. I want him to wait for a few days.

Pandit G. B. Pant : I am prepared to wait even without a challenge.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee : In Calcutta as well as in other parts West Bengal there has been going on a campaign. There were two hartals all over West Bengal, and particularly in the Calcutta region, which has the largest, numerically largest, concentration of Hindi-speaking people anywhere in India. And these two hartals were bigger hartals than any hartal held in India in the best days of the Gandhi age. I know Congressmen have come to me in this House and told me how they felt proud that in today's conditions in Calcutta, a hartal of this kind could be held successfully, non-violently, peacefully. For weeks now, satyagraha is going on, and I find in the papers dated the 16th April, that up to the 12th April, a total of 7,548 demonstrators were arrested in West Bengal in connection with the movement to protest against the West Bengal-Bihar merger proposals.

[*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair*]

Now, this satyagraha is also conducted on the most unexceptionable lines. I know the Prime Minister goes out of his way from time to time—only too often—to say that this is a kind of coercion of the administration. What is sauce for the gander is not sauce for the goose! This kind of discriminatory approach to the people's problems, this kind of failure to try to realise what is at the back of the people's minds, is symptomatic of the character of this administration which, in spite of certain good things being done—good things with which everybody is willing to collaborate—demarcates itself away from the people, is afraid of the people all the time, is afraid of the people's consistent co-operation in the reconstruction of the country. And that is why

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

when the people practice this kind of satyagraha in the most peaceful manner imaginable, the news of the satyagraha is blacked out in the all-India papers, as far as I can make out, and then we are told, "You are trying to coerce us". What are we supposed to do?

I remember the Prime Minister was here on the day before the Calcutta hartal on the 24th February. He was speaking on the 23rd February. Shrimati Renu Chakravarty asked him a question, and he made a cheap jibe at us and said, "Tomorrow, we shall find out in Calcutta. You know more about how hartals are done in Calcutta", that is to say, buses are burnt, trams are broken and all kinds of enormities practised. And when the hartal continued, not in the Delhi fashion where when we had a hartal against the Goa incidents buses were running all over the place in the Capital—I was amazed to see why—but in Calcutta till midnight everything was dead in a region which ran for miles, and miles, when that hartal happened, not a ripple was caused in the doves which prevail in this place. That shows the kind of detachment from the people that prevails here.

Any number of municipal elections have been held in West Bengal—at least ten—and in all those municipal elections, the Congress has been floored, in some of them, the Congress has not dared to appear, just as in the case of Bombay, Congress does not dare to put up its candidates for the bye-elections. In regard to the Calcutta Corporation, which is a queer body, with a very limited franchise, which is possibly unconstitutional,—because very few people have the right to vote for the Calcutta Corporation elections—the elections were due this year, and Dr. Roy had said late in February, or perhaps in March, that the elections would be held—they would not be postponed. But they were postponed in spite of the open challenge given by all non-Congress parties in Calcutta and all over West Bengal that these elections would be an acid test. Those elections were postponed.

Today from Bihar, the Lok Sevak Sangh, founded by Nibaran Chandra Das Gupta—I do not see my friend, Shri Satya Narayan Sinha here; he knows more about Nibaran Das Gupta and his character—this Sangh under

Atul Chandra Ghosh—not, thank God, our colourful colleague Shri Atulya Ghosh, who sometimes opens his mouth in this House—under Atul Chandra Ghosh, the Lok Sevak Sangh is conducting a trek—he is 79 years of age—from Manbhum to Calcutta in order to practise satyagraha there. If you go and ask the greatest Gandhi-ites who are living, about Atul Chandra Ghosh—not, fortunately, I say again Atulya Ghosh—they would know who he is; and he is going with a lot of his own people in order to tell them how this merger proposal is going to do harm to everybody, and how the restoration to West Bengal of those areas which indubitably belong to her by linguistic right is the only and proper solution of this problem. All this is going on and we are being given homilies about peace and non-violence. Go to Calcutta and see how this movement is being conducted. Every day, every afternoon, crowds of people are going to jail. People are enthused. Every day, day after day, rain or shine, it goes on and people are going to jail. This movement is being conducted. You go and see the election campaign and you will see how they are responding to this idea. Why, in that case, if you have a two-pennyworth of consideration for the people's desire, are you going to make this imposition on Calcutta? This is political blackmail; I call it dishonesty of the worst water when Government comes forward and tells Parliament that it has got ready the apparatus for introducing a separate Bill for the purpose of the amalgamation of West Bengal and Bihar. But Government has not the guts to say on the 16th March—I think it was on that date—when the Prime Minister made certain announcements, or it was earlier?

An Hon. Member : January.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee : The Prime Minister made certain announcements. Certain definite proposals were made about the boundaries of West Bengal and Bihar, and these proposals have been forgotten or withdrawn. How this happened, I do not know.

2 P.M.

I have got here a copy of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, a stridently Congress journal, which brings out with big headlines whatever Shri Atulya Ghosh has got to say. This *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, in its Calcutta edition of the 19th April, says that Maulana Abul Kalam Azad,

one of the triumvirate which rules this country, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, a member of the Congress sub-committee on the S.R.C. Report had, in a special interview, categorically stated that the recommended areas for transfer to West Bengal should come under the West Bengal region of the Bengal-Bihar union. Earlier, in a Press Conference, the Maulana had said that the union proposal was not an alternative to boundary adjustment. He also said in that Press Conference that in case the union proposal did not materialise, the decision of the Central Government for transferring the recommended areas to Bengal would stand. I would say that if Dr. Roy was here and if he was really to speak his own mind, he would tell the Maulana—

यह क्या शर्का मुझे खिलायी ?

what is all this, reminiscent of *Delhi ka laddu* ?

दिल्ली का लड्डू जो खाया वह पकताया, जो नहीं खाया यह भी पकताया ।

What is the point of all this? Why mislead people? Why not come forward and say, "we have got ready two alternative sets of proposals to be incorporated into this Bill before this session is out?"

I think my hon. friend, Shri Basu put a question—I was not here in Delhi at that time—to the Home Minister as to whether it would be done this session, and he gave evasive answers. I do not want him to give an answer now. But, let him please, for Heaven's sake, think of the matter; let him just ask himself why he should be treating the people in that part of the country so shabbily. It may be because you think that Dr. B. C. Roy is on the top of the world? But is he?

I remember that in September 1953, when there was a discussion in this House on the circumstances leading to the death of Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee in Kashmir, I had occasion to say about Dr. Roy, that, while he was a very eminent doctor, politically he was an imbecile. I repeat it. Depending upon the position of this person, the presumed, supposed and imaginary position of this person in West Bengal, you played ducks and drakes with the destinies of the people there.

I am sorry I have to concentrate whatever I have to say in regard to West Bengal—I had lots to say about

other areas like the Punjab, Bombay, Orissa and Hyderabad, because I do not want to give an impression that I am a chauvinist Bengali; I am nothing of that sort,—but I want to say this.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): May I ask whether it is parliamentary to speak of a person as an imbecile when he is not here to defend himself?

An Hon. Member: He is here. (*Interruption.*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That should not be settled among the Members themselves.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I do not say this as a Bengali chauvinist. But I refer to this only as an instance of the callous, anti-people attitude of the Government and also as an instance which illustrates how Government is afraid of West Bengal remaining as West Bengal, unhindered by the majority of Bihar, West Bengal remaining as a bastion of militant fighters for the reconstruction of our country according to the socialist pattern—which Congress also parades today. It is only because you are afraid of the people's movement in West Bengal that you are taking these measures. It is only because you have learnt your lesson from the hartal in West Bengal. I repeat—it is in the largest single concentration of Hindi-speaking people anywhere in India—that is, Greater Calcutta—that hartal was declared twice. Did it happen because the Biharis just succumbed to the coercion of the Bengalis? I have friends among the Biharis. If the Biharis wanted to resist, they would have done it; but they kept together to the slogan *Bengali Bihari Bhai, Bhai*. We want Bihar also to be happy. We do not want the united, merged West Bengal-Bihar to be a jumping ground for politicians,—power-hungry politicians—trying to take advantage of this intrigue here or that intrigue there. We do not want that. We do want the people in Bihar as well as in West Bengal to go ahead. And, that is why I said that this is the symptom of the character of Government and this is the kind of thread running through this Bill. Why this distrust of the people? That is why I do not know whether I shall laugh or I shall cry, when the Prime Minister talks as he talked only the day before yesterday about emotional integration. Of course, we want emotional integration.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

But, how is that emotional integration going to happen? We are all Indians; we have no doubt it. We thrilled when the Home Minister spoke of "this great country of India". We know that the Himalayas are there as

स्थितः पृथिव्या इव मापदंडम्

"like the backbone of the world". We do not want the backbone of our people to be crushed and mangled and battered. We want the people in different parts of our country, who speak different languages but who, at the same time, share in the great totality, in the great entity which is the culture of India, to live together happily on equal terms of friendship and co-operation. We rely on the Central Government to obliterate difficulties between the States when they arise. That is why the Central Government is given the charge of planning. It is argued that the refugee problem would be solved if Bihar and West Bengal were combined; it is so much moonshine and nonsense. Bihar has no land to spare. It is only in the Adivasi area, where other people cannot go, that there is some land.

I have here some documents which I once passed on to Shri Ajit Prasad Jain, when he was Minister of Rehabilitation and I think I showed these documents also to Shri Mehr Chand Khanna, to show how the present rulers of Bihar, particularly the Minister called Shri Krishna Ballabh Sahai, feel. Here is a photostat copy of a letter which he sent to an organisation called the Colonisation Society of India, which offered to 800 Bengali families land for settlement in Bihar without any kind of trouble or difficulty. This was resisted and opposed by the Bihar Minister only because he is one of the ruling clique of Bihar and he did not like the idea of Bengalis settling in that part of the country. Here, we find the statistics showing that so many hundreds of thousands of acres are there in Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka and Hyderabad. Out of that Bihar has a share of 12,000 acres and that is not reclaimed. We cannot blame Bihar (*Interruption*). I can say this that Bihar has no land and, therefore, the problem of refugee rehabilitation.

Shri M. P. Mishra (Monghyr North-West): Will the hon. Member. . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is not giving in.

Shri M. P. Mishra: I only want the letter to be placed on the Table of the House; he referred to the letter of the Minister.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Member any objection to the letter being placed on the Table of the House?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am prepared if you direct me to lay it on the Table of this House. This is a photostat copy of the letter written by Shri Krishna Ballabh Sahai to the Secretary of the Colonisation Society of India, in Mecluskieganj. The photostat copy of the letter had already been sent by myself to Government in 1953—to Shri Ajit Prasad Jain. If you direct me I shall take this out of my file.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think it can be placed on the Table [*Placed in Library, See No. S-160*].

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I was only trying to be fair to Bihar. I do not wish to say that arguments like the possible solution of the refugee problem by merger are advanced deliberately in order to mislead the ignorant population of both Bihar and West Bengal. It is not to hurt Bihar that I was saying this. I was only saying this that it is necessary to realise that there must be linguistic States. That is why I feel that there are some lacunae, that there are some defects and deficiencies in the Bill. I do not have the illusion that all these deficiencies will be corrected in the Joint Select Committee but I wish that they are rectified as much as possible. I do wish to conclude by expressing a hope that when the Bill comes back to us again, we shall find it in a very much better shape than it is here at the moment.

श्री वी० जी० देशपांडे (गुना) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह विषयक जो सदन के सम्मुख आया है, मैं उस का विरोध करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ, लेकिन मैं किसी दल विशेष के या राजनैतिक विरोधी होने के कारण ऐसा नहीं कर रहा हूँ यह मान्य करना होगा कि जब से राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग का इतिवृत्त प्रकाशित हुआ है, उस के पश्चात् जिस प्रकार की कलह कल्पना हुई है, जिस प्रकार का वातावरण निर्मित हुआ है, जिस का उल्लेख हमारे गृह मंत्री ने केवल एक वाक्य में किया है कि :

"Some have anguish in their hearts."

अर्थात् कुछ के हृदयों में दुःख है; उस के सम्बन्ध में मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह दुःख केवल कुछ हृदयों में ही नहीं है, देश भर में एक ऐसी परिस्थिति का निर्माण हुआ है जिस को देख कर परसों हमारे प्रधान मंत्री बड़े दुःखित हुए थे। परन्तु उन के दुःख के साथ सहानुभूति रखते हुए भारत के प्रधान मंत्री और गृह मंत्री दोनों के साथ सहानुभूति रखते हुए मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि वे किस प्रकार का विषयक यहाँ पर ले आये हैं, और जिस प्रकार की सूचनायें उन्होंने यहाँ जनता के सम्मुख रखी हैं, और जो परिणाम आज मैं देश में देख रहा हूँ उस के कारण आप के साथ ही साथ हम को भी दुःख हुआ है। परन्तु मैं आज यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो यह दुःखदायक परिस्थिति देश में निर्मित हुई है, भाषावाद और प्रान्तीयतावाद, कलह और संशय का जो वायुमंडल देश में उत्पन्न हुआ है, वह भी उस समय जब कि पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारा संघर्ष होने के कारण भारत में एकता की आवश्यकता है, उस के लिये आज हमारे नेतागण की मनोवृत्ति और विचार-धारा तथा जो यह विषयक वे लेकर आये हैं, वह जिम्मेदार है और उसी के कारण आज इस प्रकार के झगड़े चल रहे हैं।

हुबली के अन्दर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बतलाया कि आज देश के अन्दर जो झगड़े पैदा हो रहे हैं उस का कारण हमारा हिन्दु राष्ट्रवाद है। लेकिन सच्ची बात तो यह है कि हुबली के अन्दर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री शीशे में अपनी राष्ट्रीयता का रूप देख रहे थे। मुझे याद है मैं ने पंद्रह साल पहले एक सिनेमा देखा था जिस का नाम था "दुनियां न माने"। शान्ता आष्टे और दाते उस में काम करते थे।

एक माननीय सदस्य : दातार तो नहीं ?

श्री बी० जी० बेशपांडे : दातार नहीं, दाते। उस में एक बूढ़ा बकील एक जवान लड़की के साथ शादी करता है। वह बूढ़ा जब शीशे में अपने सफेद बाल देखता है तो पागल हो जाता है, और कहता है कि कौन कहता है कि मैं बूढ़ा हूँ ? मैं जवान हूँ और यह कहते-कहते वह पागल हो जाता है। वैसे ही हमारे प्रधान मंत्री की भी अपनी राष्ट्रीयता शीशे में दिखलाई पड़ती है। आज उन्होंने देखा कि बम्बई में दंगे हो रहे हैं, उड़ीसा में दंगे हो रहे हैं, जगह-जगह वही बातें चल रही हैं, पंजाबी और पंजाबी में कलह हो रही है, तो

वह सोचने लगे कि मैं तो एक नई राष्ट्रीयता लाया हूँ, कौन कहता है कि मैं ने यह झगड़े पैदा किये हैं ? और सब को गाली देने लगे। मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि आप प्रादेशिकता और प्रादेशिक राष्ट्रवाद के विपरीत जो अपनी सेकुलर (धर्म निरपेक्ष) मनोवृत्ति ला रहे हैं, जो कि हमारी संस्कृति के विरुद्ध है, जो एक विकृत अन्तराष्ट्रीयता है, उस का ही यह परिणाम है कि देश में यह झगड़े पैदा हो रहे हैं। हमारे देश को मूलतः प्राकृतिक दृष्टि से एक करने वाले हिन्दु राष्ट्रवाद को स्वीकार न करने के कारण आज यह झगड़े पैदा हो रहे हैं। एक बात तो यह है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि उन में लोक राज्यात्मक प्रवृत्ति का अभाव है। जिस समय यह प्रश्न सब के सामने आया, उस समय जगह जगह संघर्ष छिड़े, लेकिन हमने देखा कि उस समय हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने और दूसरे नेताओं ने लोकतंत्रात्मक तरीके से लोगों से उस के विषय में बड़ी पूछा। स्वयम् ही अपनी चीज को यहाँ ले आये। मुझे पूरा स्मरण है कि पिछली मर्तबा जब यहाँ पर वादविवाद हो रहा था तब हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने खड़े हो कर कहा था कि हम ने सारे झगड़े बहुत समाधानकारण रूप से तय किये हैं। मैं ने पूछा कि कौन से झगड़े, तो उन्होंने बताया कि जैसे मध्य प्रदेश का सवाल है। मैंने उन को बतलाया कि मध्य भारत के लोग मध्य प्रदेश में जाने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं, वहाँ की ऐसेम्बली ने स्पष्ट शब्दों में प्रचंड बहुमत से मध्य प्रदेश में मिलने का विरोध किया है तो पंडित जी ने कहा कि ऐसेम्बली के अन्दर तो उन्होंने बड़े जोरका विरोध किया है लेकिन

they have not fought on the streets. चूँकि लोगों ने रास्तों पर झगड़ा नहीं किया; इस लिये वह इस को मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं कि मध्य भारत में मध्य प्रदेश में मिलने के विरुद्ध मत है। जो झगड़े करते हैं, जो तनाव पैदा करते हैं, खून की नदियाँ बहाते हैं, उन की बातों का ज्यादा यकीन किया जाता है, उन की बात ज्यादा सोची जाती है। उन के बारे में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री वैलिग्ट (वीर), ग्रेट (महान) आदि विशेषण इस्तेमाल करते हैं, प्रेम गायामों में बिलवेड (प्रेमिका) शब्द आता है, उन को बिलवेड का नाम दिया जाता है। लेकिन जो लोग वैधानिक मार्ग से उन के पास अपनी बात पहुँचाना चाहते हैं, उन की

[श्री बी० जी० देशपांडे]

कोई बात सुनने के लिये वे तैयार नहीं हैं। इस का परिणाम आज हम इस बिल की प्रगति के रूप में देख रहे हैं। इस बिल के विषय में एक एक प्रश्न पर मैं आपना विरोध प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ। जिस प्रकार से मध्य भारत और मध्य प्रदेश को आप ने एक किया है, उस को करते समय आप ने सीमाओं का विचार नहीं किया। ग्वालियर पूरा नष्ट हो गया है। १ अक्तूबर के बाद ग्वालियर के अन्दर रहने वाली जनता की ग्रामदनी कम होने वाली है, जिस को एक रुपया मिलता है, उस को १ अक्तूबर के बाद ८ आ० और ६ आ० मिलने की आशा भी नहीं है। लेकिन जो उन का शिष्ट मंडल यहाँ आ कर अपनी बात आप के सम्मुख रखना चाहता है, उस की बात सोची तक नहीं जाती, उन का कोई सवाल ही यहाँ नहीं माना जाता है। इस प्रकार से वहाँ का प्रान्त आप ने बनवा दिया। बंगाल और बिहार को एक करने के मामले में मेरे मित्र श्री हीरेन मुकर्जी ने आप को बता दिया है कि वहाँ पर किस प्रकार का संघर्ष चल रहा है। सब जगह एक ही भावना है। जैसा आप ने कहा कि मैं कम्युनिस्ट नहीं हूँ लेकिन शायद कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का राज्य हो जाने के डर से ही उन्होंने बंगाल और बिहार को एक कर देना उचित समझा। वह जानते हैं कि अगर बंगाल और बिहार को एक कर दिया गया तो कांग्रेस राज्य अबाधगति से चलता रहेगा। इसी एक भावना से बंगाल और बिहार को एक करने की योजना वहाँ चल रही है।

पंजाब के विषय में वह बताया गया कि वहाँ पर सब लोगों ने पंजाब की योजना को मान लिया है, लेकिन यह सब लोग हैं कौन? वहाँ पर आप ने अपनी पार्टी अर्थात् कांग्रेस का अधिवेशन अमृतसर में कर लिया, वहाँ पर जब इस को पेश किया गया तब, सब जानते हैं, वहाँ पर इस का कितना बड़ा विरोध हुआ। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि झगड़ा मिटना नहीं चाहिये, झगड़ा मिटाया जा सकता है, लेकिन आप का झगड़े के समाधान का जो तरीका है, आप की बात करने और काम करने का जो तरीका है वह ठीक नहीं है। विरोधियों की बात को नहीं सुना नहीं गया। महापंजाब समिति ने बार-बार कहा कि हम को बताइये तो सही कि क्या समझौता हो रहा है। लेकिन जब तक उस के लिये अनशन नहीं हुआ तब तक आप ने कुछ नहीं बताया। और आज भी जब विरोध हो रहा है तो आप कहते हैं कि कोई भी विरोध नहीं है। मैं आप से

पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आप मुझे बतलाइये क्या पूरी तरह से सन्तोषजनक रूप में हमें काम नहीं करना चाहिये? आज बहुत सी बातें अच्छी हैं, बहुत सी खराब भी हैं, मैं समझता हूँ कि आप का एक ही निर्णय बता देता है कि आपकी राष्ट्रीयता की मनोवृत्ति कैसी है और आप क्या करना चाहते हैं। वह निर्णय है बम्बई के सम्बन्ध में। बम्बई के विषय में जो निर्णय आप ने किया है और जान बूझ कर जो आज आप करने जा रहे हैं, उस के ही कारण अगर आप पूरा विधेयक फेंक देना चाहें तो कोई बुरी बात नहीं होगी, ऐसा आप कर सकते हैं। बम्बई के विषय में जो हम पूछते हैं तो बहुत से दोस्त आ जाते हैं और कहते हैं कि, छोड़ो भी, लिग्विज्म (भाषा वाद) से, भाषावार प्रान्त से देश बहुत बड़ी चीज है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि लिग्विज्म किस प्रकार से आया है, भाषावार झगड़े कौन करते हैं। आप का यह दावा है कि महाराष्ट्र प्रदेश आप ने बना दिया है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री नेहरू जी ने कहा कि भौगोलिक दृष्टि से बम्बई महाराष्ट्र प्रदेश में आता है। लेकिन महाराष्ट्र प्रदेश बनाते समय आप ने बम्बई को उस से निकाल दिया। आखिर आप ने यह क्यों किया? ऐसी कौन सी बात है, जिस के कारण आप को यह करना पड़ा? आप कहते हैं कि कलकत्ते में ७० फी सदी लोग बंगाली बोलते हैं, जब कि बम्बई में मराठी बोलने वाले इतने अधिक नहीं हैं, वहाँ गुजराती बोलने वाले भी रहते हैं, हिन्दी बोलने वाले भी रहते हैं। कन्नड़-वाले भी रहते हैं और इस कारण से जो भाषावार प्रान्त आप ने बनाये हैं उन में से बम्बई शहर को निकाल दिया है। आप कहते हैं कि हम लिग्विज्म की बात को ले कर आते हैं, लेकिन लिग्विज्म की बात असल में लेकर आप आये हैं। आप जान बूझ कर इस को समझना नहीं चाहते हैं। आज आप बम्बई शहर को निकाल रहे हैं भाषा के आधार पर। लेकिन आज लिग्विज्म के आधार पर बम्बई किस तरफ़ जाता है जिस को आप निकालना चाहते हैं। फिर आगे बढ़ कर आप कहते हैं कि आप लोकराज्य के रास्ते से सारे काम करते हैं। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि आप बम्बई को किस तरह के लोकराज्य के अनुसार महाराष्ट्र से निकाल रहे हैं। बम्बई शहर जो है वह महाराष्ट्र का है। इसी सवाल पर महाराष्ट्र के ३२ मंत्रों ने वहाँ की विधान सभा से त्याग-पत्र दे दिया। वहाँ के पत्रनिर्वाचन से कांग्रेस की हिम्मत नहीं हुई कि किसी शक्ति को उन के खिलाफ़ खड़ा

करे। उसके पश्चात् आपने बम्बई की असैम्बली में देखा कि जितने भराटी बोलने वाले सदस्य थे उनमें से २७ ने आपकी तरफ से आदेश जाने के बावजूद, आप की तरफ से व्हिप (सचेतक) जाने के बावजूद, इसके खिलाफ वोट दिया। आपने यह भी देखा होगा कि म्युनिसिपैलिटीज और कारपोरेशंस (निगमों) के सैकड़ों मੈम्बरों ने त्यागपत्र दे दिये। आपने लोक राज्य को अलग रख कर उनकी जगहों के लिये उपनिर्वाचन कराये नहीं। आपको यह भी मालूम ही है कि बम्बई की कारपोरेशन ने जिसमें कि लोगों के चुने हुए प्रतिनिधि हैं, जनतंत्रात्मक पद्धति से एक प्रस्ताव पास करके यह मांग की कि हम महाराष्ट्र के साथ मिलना चाहते हैं। महाराष्ट्र के जितने भी प्रतिनिधि हैं उनमें से एक ने भी आपके बिल के पक्ष में वोट नहीं दिया। बहुत से लोग अनुशासन भंग न करने के कारण तटस्थ रहे। बम्बई के लोग और महाराष्ट्र के लोग जनतंत्रात्मक पद्धति से यह मांग करते हैं कि हमें महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिया जाए। लेकिन खेद का विषय है कि आप उनके ऊपर अपना निर्णय ठोसना चाहते हैं। यह कहाँ का लोकराज्य है इस बात का मुझे पता नहीं है।

एक बात यह भी कही जाती है कि बम्बई में बड़े दंगे हुए जिनके कारण आपको बहुत दुःख हुआ। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि मैं पहले तो यह कहता था कि शायद यह गवर्नमेंट की कमजोरी है। लेकिन मैं आपसे पूछता हूँ कि यह दंगे करने वाले कौन थे? मैं वहाँ पर स्वयं गया हूँ और मैं यह बात खुल्लम-खुल्ला चुनौती के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि यह हम लोग नहीं थे जिन्होंने दंगे कराये हैं, यह मोरारजी देसाई ने लोगों पर गोली चलवा कर अत्याचार किये हैं। अगर आप यह कहते हैं कि हम लोगों ने दंगे करवाये हैं तो इसका जवाब मैं यही दे सकता हूँ कि आप एक जांच कमीशन नियुक्त कर दीजिये जो इस सारे मामले की जांच करे और जो दोषी हो उसको सजा देने के लिये सिफारिशें करें। इसके जवाब में आप एक बड़ाप्रशस्त युक्तिवाद ले आते हैं और कहते हैं कि Let the wounds be healed first जल्म जो हैं उनको पहले ठीक करना चाहिये। आप हकीम और डाक्टर हो गये जो जख्मों को ठीक करने लग गये। मोरारजी देसाई के दो बयान मने पडे हैं और उन्होंने बार-बार

पहले बयान में तो यह आरोप लगाये हैं कि वहाँ के लोगों ने यह यह अत्याचार किये हैं पूरी समाज यह के खिलाफ हैं। फिर बाद में वह कहते हैं कि यह जो अत्याचार हुए हैं ये गुण्डों का काम है। मैं आपसे कहता हूँ कि जब आप आरोप लगाते हैं कि वहाँ पर किसी ने अत्याचार किये हैं तो जब आपसे एक इन्क्वायरी कमीशन (जांच आयोग) बैठाने के लिये कहा जाता है और आपको आरोपों को सिद्ध करने के लिये कहा जाता है तो आप इस मांग को क्यों नहीं मानते हैं। अगर हम दोषी हैं, मैं फिर कहता हूँ तो हमें आप सजा दें, इसके लिये हम तैयार हैं। आप संदिग्ध शब्दों में यह कहते हैं कि पहले सद्भावना पैदा करना जरूरी है और उसके बाद ही कुछ किया जा सकता है और यह भी आप कहते हैं कि कोई सरकार का फैसला आखिरी नहीं होता है और उसको बदला जा सकता है और उसके बारे में जांच की जा सकती है। आप स्पष्ट शब्दों में यह क्यों नहीं कहते हैं कि सब बातें बन्द होनी चाहियें और हम इस मामले पर चर्चा करने को तैयार हैं। आपने जो निर्णय किया है, उसका परिणाम क्या हुआ है? मैं अभी बम्बई घूम कर आया हूँ और अपने अनुभव से आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ पर जो असन्तोष फैला हुआ है उसे देखकर मेरा हृदय कांपता है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि अगर बम्बई अलग रहता है तो क्या होने वाला है और अगर मिला दिया जाता है तो क्या होने वाला है। ग्वालियर की भी बात में ने कही थी कि अगर वहाँ से राजधानी हटा ली गई तो लोग भूखों मर जायेंगे। बम्बई में आज कारखाने चल रहे हैं, पोर्ट चल रही है और मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर इसको महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिया गया तो इनको कोई नुकसान नहीं पहुंचेगा। वहाँ पर जाने के पश्चात् और जनता की भावना की तीव्रता को देखने के पश्चात् मैं यह कह सकता हूँ कि यह जो भावनायें लोगों के दिलों में हैं कि बम्बई अवश्य ही महाराष्ट्र में मिलनी चाहिये, यह भावनायें केवल नेताओं की पैदा की हुई नहीं हैं, ये नेताओं की भड़काई हुई नहीं हैं, ये ऐतिहासिक भावनायें हैं और इनको दबाया नहीं जा सकता। मध्य भारत के बारे में तो आपने तत्काल जैन को, गंगुवाल को तथा औरों को बुला लिया और उनसे कह दिया कि तुम को मिनिस्टर बना दिया जायेगा और आपने मासला तय कर लिया। लेकिन मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह से आप संकराव देव, गाडगीळ,

... [श्री वी० जी० देशपांडे]

हिये, इत्यादि को बूलाकर यदि इस मामले को तय करना चाहें तो यह तय नहीं हो सकेगा। जो लोग समझौता करेंगे, वे खत्म हो जायेंगे। इस प्रकार की भावना मैंने वहां पर पाई है। मैंने देखा है कि सामान्य जनता की आर्थिक, सामाजिक और जीवन विषयक आशाओं के साथ संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की आशा और प्रश्न निहित है। आप इसकी उपेक्षा न करें। आप इस प्रश्न की तरफ पावर-पॉलिटिक्स (शक्ति की राजनीति) और सत्ता की राजनीति का एक भाग समझ कर देखते हैं। मैं आपको बताता हूँ कि दीवार पर जो लिखा है उसको आप पढ़ें, वह सब मेरी आंखों के सामने है। महाराष्ट्र में एक नई क्रान्ति धीरे-धीरे हो रही है। लोग वहां पर पूछते हैं कि भाई यहां कोई पता नहीं है कि किस से बात की जाये। आप किसी भी नेता के साथ बात करें और किसी भी समझौते पर आप पहुंचें, वहां के लोग इसे मानने वाले नहीं हैं। वहां के लोगों की एक ही मांग है और वह सीधी साधी मांग है और वह मांग यह है कि बम्बई हमारी है और इसे हमें दिया जाये। इस देश को अगर आप किसी की जायदाद समझ कर बटवारा करना चाहें तो ऐसा नहीं हो सकता है। कहा जाता है कि बम्बई हिन्दुस्तान का एक हिस्सा है, इसे मैं भी मानता हूँ। परन्तु कलकत्ता भी तो हिन्दुस्तान का ही एक हिस्सा है और इसी तरह से हिन्दुस्तान के दूसरे शहर भी तो इसी हिन्दुस्तान के हिस्से हैं। अगर कोई वेश्या यह कहे कि एक आदमी से मेरी शादी अगर हो जाये तो मेरा कास्मोपोलिटन कारेक्टर जो है वह चला जायेगा, तो यह बात मेरी समझ में तो आती नहीं है। किस तरह से अगर बम्बई को किसी दूसरे राज्य में मिला दिया गया तो उसका कास्मोपोलिटन कारेक्टर चला जाएगा, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। यह एक गलत बात है और इस प्रकार की दलील दे कर आप महाराष्ट्र में एक क्रान्ति ला रहे हैं और उस क्रान्ति का दुष्परिणाम आज यह हो रहा है कि आज देश में आप एक राष्ट्र की भावना का निर्माण नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। अगर आप इस प्रकार से हर शहर के लिये यही नीति अपनायेंगे तो पता नहीं हमारे देश का क्या बनेगा। हमारे देश में धीरे-धीरे अनेक शहर जैसे दुर्गापुर जहां पर कि स्टील प्लांट लग रहा है, टाटा नगर, जहां पर भी एक स्टील प्लांट है, और इसी तरह से दूसरे नए शहर

बन रहे हैं और जब यहां पर भारत के दूसरे हिस्सों से आ कर लोग नौकरी करेंगे और यहां पर बस जायेंगे तो ये भी कास्मोपोलिटन शहर बन जायेंगे तो क्या आप इनको उस प्रान्त में से निकाल कर, यूनियन टैरिटरी (संघ क्षेत्र) बनाने के लिये तैयार होंगे। अगर ऐसी बात है तो यूनियन टैरिटरी बनाने का आपको एक नया कारखाना शुरू करना पड़ेगा और संविधान को तथा शेड्यूल को आपको रोज बदलना पड़ेगा। आज भी आप प्रोसीजर (प्रक्रिया) को रोज रोज तबदील करते रहते हैं, कांस्टीट्यूशन को रोज रोज बदलते रहते हैं और इसमें आपको कोई तकलीफ नहीं होती। उस वक्त भी आपको यूनियन टैरिटरीज की संख्या बहुत बढ़ानी पड़ेगी।

जिस तरह से आप इतने बड़े बड़े देश के पुनर्निर्माण करने जा रहे हैं, वह फंडमेंटली (मूल रूप से) बैसिकली (आधार भूत रूप से) और आइड्योलोजिकली (सिद्धान्तिक रूप से) गलत है। बम्बई के बारे में जो रख आपने अस्तित्वार किया है, और इसी प्रकार की और बहुत सी गलत बातें जो आपने की हैं, इस में आपने जो जोनल काउंसिल्स (परिषदें) बनाई हैं, इनके कारण देश की एकता खतरे में पड़ गई है। आपने मध्य प्रदेश के स्पीकर और डिप्टी स्पीकर को पूरे नये मध्य प्रदेश का स्पीकर और डिप्टी स्पीकर बना दिया है। अब जो यह डिप्टी स्पीकर है, यह मराठी प्रदेश का है और सोनेर से निर्वाचित हुआ है। आप इसको हमारे नये मध्य प्रदेश के जो मेंबर होंगे उनके ऊपर ठोस रहे हैं। इस प्रकार की अनेकों बातें हैं जिनके बारे में मैं जब क्लाइम-बाई-क्लाज डिसकशन (खंडवार चर्चा) होगा उसमें चर्चा करूंगा। लेकिन इस विधेयक के अन्दर बंगाल बिहार को जिस प्रकार आपने रखा है, जिस प्रकार उड़ीसा को आपने इसमें रखा है, नया मध्य प्रदेश बनाते वक्त, मध्य भारत और ग्वालियर की जो उपेक्षा की है, बम्बई के विषय में आप ने महान अन्याय किया है, मैं इनका विरोध करता हूँ। आपके ऊपर भगवान ने एक बहुत बड़ा उत्तरदायित्व डाला था, इस महान देश का शासन आपके हाथ में सौंपा गया था और अब आप इस देश का पुनर्निर्माण करना चाहते हैं और यह करते वक्त आप की मूल भूत विचार धारा जो है यह बिल्कुल गलत और फंडमेंटली रांग होने के कारण, आपने देश का ग्रहित किया है। आपने हिन्दु-राष्ट्रवादिता को स्वीकार न करके, आपने गलत कदम उठा

कर जो झगड़े इस देश में कराये हैं, इससे तो शायद देश के टुकड़े-टुकड़े हो सकते हैं आज आप जो इस प्रकार का विधेयक लाये हैं, इसका मैं विरोध करता हूँ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Ramananda Tirtha. Now, I would request the hon. Members from Bombay not to make an attempt to catch my eye, to-day.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar): Is there any zonal distribution?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have only said this. I have advised them not to make an attempt. Is there any objection?

Shri Nand Lal Sharma: Is there any distribution of time?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: What is the harm? Time may have to be distributed zonewise also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I must be frank. I do not propose to call Members from Bombay today. Time may also have to be allotted so far as this Bill is concerned; there is no harm.

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Pratapgarh Distt.—west cum Rae Bareilly Distt.—East): But there are some Members who would like to speak on Bombay, but who do not belong to Bombay. Can they speak today?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Certainly. I cannot prevent that. Every hon. Member has got a right to discuss the whole Bill. I have only asked Members coming from Bombay not to try to catch my eye today.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha (Gulberga): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, we are discussing one of the most important Bills in the course of these three days. This Bill is going to change the shape of India. It will also determine the cohesion and the depth of the democratic life of this great Republic. I, therefore, attach the greatest importance to the provisions made in this Bill and would deal with them as best as I can with all the restraint and responsibility that should be attached to it.

There are certain provisions in this Bill to which I cannot conscientiously agree. There are others which every one of us would commend. I would leave some important aspects of the Bill to the latter part of my speech, but some of the minor points I would like to deal with in the first instance.

3—93 Lok Sabha.

At the very outset, let me congratulate the members of the Hyderabad Assembly for having unanimously and unitedly dealt with all the problems that affected them in the wake of disintegration of Hyderabad. I would plead with the members of the Select Committee and with the Members of this hon. House, that they accept the change in the name of Andhra-Telangana into Andhra Pradesh, which has been unanimously advocated by the Hyderabad Assembly and also by the Andhra Assembly. I also take this opportunity to congratulate my friends, who at one time advocated the idea of a separate Telangana, for having fallen in line with the popular aspirations of the people and would, even at this stage, urge them not to stand on prestige and insist on the name of Telugu Pradesh. That would amount to betraying the smallness of the mind.

There is another point which I would like to make here. I do not know why the name of Mysore is being continued for this new State. Why not Karnatak? It is better name. It can inspire better and greater hopes and will perhaps deepen the democratic sense of the people of that region if this name is given to it.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): You want it to be named Karnatak?

Swami Ramananda Tirtha: Yes. There is one thing which is amazing in regard to this Mysore State. I hardly refer to any personalities, but in discussions we have to refer to certain persons. The present Chief Minister of Mysore State was enthusiastic about the bilingual State of Karnatak. Well, I would only wish him that this is not the stage when these ideas have to be imported into the minds of the people. There is a proposal for consideration which has been adopted by the Mysore Assembly and, in the fullness of time, if the people of two or three States so desire they can come together. Nobody in this democracy is going to be prevented from amalgamating, merging or coalescing.

At the same time, it is necessary that, when vast areas from one State are being transferred or merged into other States, you create a sense of security, you create a sense of 'no-dislocation' amongst the people of those areas so far as the services are concerned. I take strong objection to the statement made by the Chief Minister of Mysore, when he says that

[Swami Ramananda Tirtha]

the service conditions of those areas, which are being merged in the present Mysore State, cannot be guaranteed to the people transferred. Here is a provision in this Bill which guarantees the service conditions of the people who are in the administration, and no Chief Minister, howsoever highly placed, can change the provisions in the draft Bill, unless this august House agrees to do so. Sir, I would like, on behalf of the House, if the House permits me, to reassure the service personnel that in the new dispensation the service conditions will not be affected unless the successor State Legislatures decide so or the President agrees to do that.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: You want uniformity in conditions?

Swami Ramananda Tirtha: Yes.

Then there is a small matter in regard to Karnatak. As one belonging to a composite State, I have to plead with the House: "Please retain the headquarters of Bidar District in the Bidar City". In the present decision Bidar District is being completely wiped off. That would affect the life of the people of that district very greatly. The Hyderabad Assembly has unanimously suggested an amendment that Bidar District consisting of four talukas should be retained as it is and in the next phase, when Karnatak or Mysore State is formed, district reorganisations may be again undertaken and certain parts from Gulbarga District may be added to it. It is very necessary. I draw the attention of the members of the Select Committee to this urgent need of the people of that area.

There are border disputes here, there and everywhere; some may be genuine, some may not be genuine. The enthusiasts of a particular region may be very keen about certain parts. I do not want to go into the merits and demerits of those claims, but I would urge upon this House to make a provision in this Bill, which I do not find so far, for the appointment of a Boundary Commission or Commissions, so that all these border disputes should be amicably settled and whatever decisions are reached by those Commissions should be accepted by all concerned.

So far as the safeguards to the linguistic minorities are concerned, I would plead one thing. It is of the utmost necessity that a sense of security created, fostered in the minds of

linguistic minorities in every State. No State is going to be created where there is no linguistic minority. Let us reassure them that in all the stages of evolution, as citizens of that particular area they will get equal opportunities and no domination of the linguistic majority will be tolerated or allowed. That is a very great responsibility devolving upon us all. I am not enthusiastic about the Regional Councils. It is—if I may use that expression—a hideous proposal. I can understand Regional Councils in regard to Punjab because conditions and circumstances and the problems there are different. I do not understand the Regional Councils for Telangana or a Regional Council for any other State. Why this disintegrating force again? Regional Councils in the context of the Punjab are understandable, justifiable and necessary. I fully support that idea. But this idea of Regional Councils pertaining to every region, to every new State, is going to cut at the root of the proper integration of these different regions into a single State. I would, therefore, urge upon the House not to extend these provisions to any other new State. That is all I have to say in this regard.

In regard to the safeguards about the linguistic minorities, I have to say one point more. The other Bill—The Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill—has stated that the primary education will be guaranteed to be imparted in the mother-tongue of the particular section, but there is no provision for higher education. I would suggest a small amendment for the consideration of the Members of the Joint Committee. If any private endeavour or enterprise comes forward to impart higher education in the mother-tongue of the area concerned, necessary financial grants and legal recognition should be accorded to them. It would be difficult for the State to take the whole responsibility of imparting instructions in the mother-tongue of the minorities through all stages. But, if the minority sections themselves come forward to shoulder those responsibilities, they should be permitted to do so and they should be encouraged and assisted.

Lastly, I come to the question of Bombay. I know that this question has agitated the minds of many of us including myself. Arguments have been advanced; they have been heard patiently and necessary thought has been given to them. Even then the agony is

there as the Home Minister himself said. From the utterances of the Prime Minister from time to time we feel—at least that feeling has dawned upon me—that in regard to the decision about the city of Bombay, justice has not been done. I think that inkling, that lurking idea, is in the mind of the Prime Minister. I appreciate it. I would only say that if this House feels the Maharashtrians' claim for Bombay is just, do not deny justice. If it is unjust, say so.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Who is to decide it?

Swami Ramananda Tirtha: When you say that geographically Bombay city is surrounded by Maharashtra, when you say that it may be considered to be a part of Maharashtra, then I say, "why deny the merger of Bombay city into Maharashtra?" One day that idea will come true. I take this last opportunity of making an appeal to the good sense of all the Members of this House, because after all this is a sovereign body, and I would not like to import any heat in whatever I say or anybody else will say in regard to the city of Bombay. We know that it has injured the sentiments of many. It is very difficult to heal the wounds once they are inflicted, and that is true. Therefore, none of us should try to injure and inflict any further injuries on the minds of any section of the community in this great land of ours.

There was the question of cosmopolitan character. My friend Shri S. K. Patil is here. I would like to appeal to him and I would like to appeal to the hon. Members of this House. If you deny the just claim of a particular region on the basis of its being a cosmopolitan city, you are creating a very dangerous tendency. I say you are creating a very dangerous tendency. Calcutta will lose its cosmopolitan character because it will be afraid that tomorrow, or the day after tomorrow or at any time in future it stands the risk of being excluded from the hinterland of West Bengal. Hyderabad will go the same way. Why not any other cosmopolitan city in India be viewed that way? Just give thought to this. Do not commit the mistake of separating Bombay city from Maharashtra. It is not a question of Gujaratis or Maharashtrians. They are the best of friends. They can be the best of friends. They

will live and die as friends and brothers. I have no doubt about that. Why make this question of Bombay city a tie between the Gujaratis and the Maharashtrian community? That is wrong. That is quite wrong. Therefore, I would say that this question of Bombay should be solved in a manner which can satisfy the just aspirations of the people of Maharashtra. When I say 'people of Maharashtra', I do not mean Marathi-speaking people but all those who reside in Maharashtra including the Gujaratis.

I was thinking of saying a few words of a personal note, though I am not habituated to refer to any personality. I would like to make a personal appeal to the Prime Minister. He is not here now, but I hope my feeble voice will be conveyed to him. He is not a person to stand on prestige. I know it. I have been long associated with him and I have the fullest faith in his sense of justice. Therefore I appeal to him. If you feel that Bombay is geographically surrounded by Maharashtra, that it is a part of Maharashtra, then include it in Maharashtra and give whatever guarantees and safeguards you like to the people of Bombay city, industrialists, financiers or whoever they may be—belonging to this community or that community.

Arguments are over. We cannot advance any more arguments. Whatever we could do we have done. There is no single argument left in our armoury. We appeal to the good sense and justice. We only pray that in this democracy which is growing and which will grow more and more vigorously, let there not be a sense or a feeling of justice being denied left in the minds of a large section of the people. I am saying it here and now. If anybody comes forward to convince me that the claim of Maharashtra over Bombay is unjust, I will withdraw the claim. But if it is a just claim, then do not deny it. I would say that justice delayed is justice denied. The greater the delay, more and more will be the feeling of injustice being done to the people. Therefore, I only pray—I do not argue—to the hon. Home Minister to concede this justice. Otherwise, if democratic methods are not going to give the necessary results, what is the use? Is it not the responsibility of this House to guide and direct the energies of the people into proper channels by taking the right decisions?

श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी (कृष्णगि) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस बिल का पूरे पूरे तौर से स्वागत नहीं कर सकता। कारण सिर्फ यही है कि हम भारतवर्ष की जनता से भाषावार प्रान्त, लिग्विस्टिक स्टेट्स, बनाने का जो वादा सालों से कर रहे थे उस आधार पर हम ने स्टेट्स को नहीं बनाया है। हम ने इस तरफ तबज्जह दी है लेकिन पूरी तरह से लिग्विस्टिक प्रिंसिपल (भाषा के सिद्धांत) के तत्व को मान कर नहीं चले हैं। इस लिये मैं प्रवर समिति को यह सुझाव दूंगा कि अगर हो सके तो लिग्विस्टिक स्टेट्स बनाने का जो प्रिंसिपल है उस को अमल में लाने की कोशिश करे।

आज भारतवर्ष में जो छोटे-मोटे झगड़े बांडर डिसप्यूट्स (सीमा सबन्धी विवादों) को ले कर पैदा हो गये हैं। उन के लिये कहा जाता है कि ऐडजस्ट (समायोजन) किया जाय। लेकिन अगर हम अपने जमहूरी (प्रजातंत्र) उसूल और गणतंत्र के आधार पर इस चीज को देखें कि किस एरिया का ऐस्पिरेशन (महत्वाकांक्षा) किस स्टेट में जाने का रहा है तो भी यह प्रजातंत्री तरीके के खिलाफ होगा। लिहाजा जिस तरीके से स्टेट्स का रि-आर्गनाइजेशन (पुनर्गठन) करने के लिये कमिशन बैठा था, उसी प्रकार एक बाउंड्री कमीशन (सीमा आयोग) बनाया जाय, या सब स्टेट्स के लिये अलग अलग बाउंड्री कमीशन बना दिये जायें जो वहाँ की लोकल (स्थानीय) हालत को देखते हुए अपनी सिफारिश करें। जिस तरह से श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण ने कहा है अपने बयान में कि काप्लिकेटेड प्राबलेम्स (पेचीदा समस्याओं) को प्लेबिसाइट (जन मत संग्रह) के जरिये से हल किया जा सकता है, उसी तरह से इन बाउंड्री डिसप्यूट्स को भी खत्म करना चाहिये।

दूसरी बात में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी इच्छा है कि भारतवर्ष एक यूनियन (संघ) बने। फेडरल स्टेट एक ही हो सकती है। इस लिये छोटी-छोटी फेडरल स्टेट्स बना कर उस को यूनियन आफ फेडरल स्टेट्स बनाना ठीक नहीं होगा। लिहाजा जो एक यूनियन आफ बंगाल एंड बिहार की बात की जाती है या यूनियन आफ दी सदरन स्टेट्स (दक्षिण राज्य संघ) की बात की जाती है, जो कि ऐडवाइजरी नेचर (परामर्श दायी ढंग) की होंगी, मैं उस की जरूरत भी नहीं समझता हूँ। नार्थ

(उत्तर) के भाइयों को, खुसूसन प्राइम मिनिस्टर को अगर खौफ है कि दुनिया में और हिन्दुस्तान में सेपरेटिस्ट टेन्डेन्सी (अलग-अलग की प्रवृत्ति) पैदा हो जायेगी और हर एक लोग अलग-अलग तरीके से सोचने लगेंगे, इस लिये ऐडवाइजरी नेचर रखा जाय, तो मैं इस सिलसिले में कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस से बहुत काम्प्लिकेन्स (पेचीद-गियां) पैदा होंगी।

हैदराबाद के जो तीन हिस्से बना दिये गये हैं उस का मैं स्वागत करता हूँ। अभी मुझे से पहले स्वामी जी ने जो कहा कि बीदर जिले को कायम रखना चाहिये, इस के लिये मैं उन की पुरजोर ताईद करता हूँ। अगर इस जिले को खत्म कर दिया जायगा तो वहाँ के रहने वालों के जीवन में बड़ी भारी तब्दली आ जायेगी। जब कुर्ग को, जहाँ की आबादी दो या ढाई लाख की है, एक जिला बनाया जा सकता है तो पाँच या छः लाख की आबादी वाले कुर्ग को एक जिला मानकर मैसूर स्टेट में क्यों नहीं लगाया जा सकता।

इस के अलावा मैं इस बात की मुखालिफत करता हूँ कि मैसूर का नाम फिर रख दिया गया है। एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट में कर्नाटक का जो नाम रखा गया था, मैं उसको बदलने के खिलाफ हूँ। जो यहाँ पर मैसूर स्टेट क्रिएट (निर्मित) की गई है, कोई बजह नहीं है कि उस का नाम कर्नाटक न रखा जाय। आज कोई भी इस कर्नाटक नाम के खिलाफ नहीं है। आज जो मैसूर के महाराज हैं, उन को राजाधिराज आफ कर्नाटक कहा जाता है। उन को टाइटल्स (उपाधियां) हैं वह भी कर्नाटक के नाम के तहत में ही है। हमारे जो जिले अब उस में शरीक हो रहे हैं वह भी पहले उन की राजधानी के तहत में ही थे। लिहाजा कर्नाटक का नाम ऐतिहासिक और सांस्कृतिक दृष्टि से भी ठीक है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि र्वायेंट कमिटी (संयुक्त समिति) इस पर विचार कर के उस का नाम कर्नाटक ही रखे। अगर वह ऐसा नहीं कर सकती है, तो ज्यादा से ज्यादा वह कर सकते हैं कि जो न्यू मैसूर स्टेट बन रही है उस की ऐसेम्बली के जो एलैक्टेट रिप्रेजेंटेटिव (निर्वाचित प्रतिनिधि) हों उन की राय ले लीजिये। आखिरी तौर पर इस का फैसला उन्हीं लोगों पर छोड़ दिया जाय और जो न्यू मैसूर स्टेट की ऐसेम्बली के लोग कहें उस को मूनासिब समझ कर वही नाम रखा जाय। लेकिन इस के लिये फिर से कांस्टिट्यूशन को बदलना ठीक नहीं होगा इस लिये

यह फैसला अभी से कर लिया जाय कि जो मैसूर ऐसेम्बली के लोग कहें, जो उन की यूनिनिमस (एकमत) राय हो उस के मुताबिक मैसूर का नाम रखा जाय। इस के सिलसिले में एक रेजोल्यूशन (संकल्प) मैसूर ऐसेम्बली में आया था उस के बारे में मैसूर के चीफ मिनिस्टर (मुख्य मंत्री) ने भी, जो कि एक अनकसन्डें (असम्बन्धित) आदमी थे बोलते हुए उस को सपोर्ट (समर्थन) किया था।

हमारे स्वामी जी ने एक और बात कही कि सिक्कीमो रिटी ग्राफ एम्प्लायमेंट (रोजगार की सुरक्षा) होनी चाहिये। गवर्नमेंट सर्वन्ट्स के कुछ फंडा-मेंटल राइट्स (मूल भूत अधिकार) होते हैं इस लिये जो कुछ उन्होंने कहा है वह कुछ जायज बात नहीं मालूम होती है। जहां पर भी एक एरिया (क्षेत्र) से दूसरे एरिया में लोग जाते हैं वहां पर उन की बिस्कुल सिक्कीमो रिटी हो। पंशन और पे (वेतन) के मामले में लेकिन यह कहना मुशकिल है कि उन की पे बर्गर पर कोई असर न पड़े। जहां तक नान-गजेटेड पोस्ट्स (अघोषित पदों) का सवाल है मैं चाहता हूँ कि उन की तन्स्वाह को न घटाया जाय लेकिन जो गजेटेड (घोषित) ग्राफिसर हैं उन को मैसूर के लेवल (स्तर) पर लाया जाय, यह मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन मैसूर में छोटे छोटे लेक्चरर्स होते हैं उन को १०० या १५० रुपये तन्स्वाह मिलती है। वहां के लेवल पर रखने से जो नान-गजेटेड ग्राफिसर्स हैं दूसरी जगहों के, उन की एफिशिएन्सी (कार्य क्षमता) कम हो जायेगी। इस लिये उनकी तन्स्वाहों को कायम रखना चाहिये। अगर मैसूर को नान-गजेटेड ग्राफिसर्स की तन्स्वाह कम हो तो उन को दूसरों के साथ ईक्वलाइज (समानिकरण) करने के लिये ऊपर उठाना जरूरी है। और इस को करना चाहिये।

इस के बाद ऐसेट्स और लायबिलिटीज (अस्तियां तथा दायित्यां) की कुछ बातें कही गई हैं। यह कहा गया है कि अगर कहीं पर बड़ी-बड़ी बिन्डिम्स हों उन को उसी एरिया में जाना चाहिये जहां पर कि वह जाती हो। यह बहुत ठीक है। वॉन् कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के लिहाज से भी जो कि ग्राफ्र स्टेट बनने के वक्त एप्वाइंट (नियुक्त) किया गया था, यही तय हुआ था कि डिस्ट्रिक्ट लेवल पर जो इम्पूवेबल प्रापर्टी (अचल सम्पत्ति) हो उस को भी उसी स्टेट को जाना चाहिये जहां पर कि डिस्ट्रिक्ट हो। लेकिन जो हमारे बड़े बड़े कैपिटल सिटीज

(बड़े नगर) हैं जैसे हैदराबाद, मद्रास और बम्बई, ऐसे एरियाज में बड़े बड़े बिजनेसमैन (व्यवसायी) आ कर सेन्ट्रलाइज (केंद्रित) हो गये हैं। उन को बनाने में सारी स्टेट का पैसा लगा है। इस लिये उन ऐसेट्स का कुछ हिस्सा उन एरियाज को भी मिलना चाहिये जहां पर कि वह पहले रहा हो। जिन लोगों ने उस जगह को बनाया है उन को उन का मुनासिब शेअर (अंश) जरूर मिलना चाहिये।

इस के बाद में जो छोटे-छोटे स्टेट्स की प्रॉब्लेम (समस्यायें) हैं उन के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि जब कि भारत-वर्ष में भाषावार प्रान्त बन रहे हैं तो उन में बहुत से झगड़े भी पैदा होंगे, जैसे बम्बई और दूसरे शहरों के बारे में भी बहुत से सवाल पाये जाते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इन तमाम सवालत के बारे में हम एक अजीब तरीके से सोचते हैं और जिस तरीके से गवर्नमेंट इन पर गौर करती है उससे तो मैं यह कहे बगैर नहीं रह सकता कि हम को बहुत शर्म आती है। आज भी हम यह देखते हैं कि जब किसी इलाके की मांग की जाती है और यह कहा जाता है कि लिग्बिस्टिक स्टेट्स बननी चाहिये तो उसके जवाब में गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से यह कहा जाता है कि यह चीज एंटीनेशनल (राष्ट्र विरोधी) है, यह यूनिन के खिलाफ है। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम कोई ऐसी मांग नहीं करते ह, या हमने कभी भी ऐसी मांग नहीं की है और न ही कभी करेंगे कि किसी हिस्से को एक इंडिपेंडेंट (स्वतंत्र) हिस्सा माना जाये या उसको इस देश से अलग कर दिया जाये। हम चाहते हैं कि हमारा देश एक फेडरल स्टेट हो। जब लोग यह कहते हैं कि हम को किसी दूसरी स्टेट के साथ मिला दिया जाये तो आपको चाहिये कि आप उस मांग पर गौर करें और अगर देश की बहवूदी और देश की भलाई उस में हो और उस इलाके के रहने वाले लोगों की भलाई उस में हो तो उस इलाके को आपको चाहिये कि आप उसमें मिला दें। अगर आप ऐसा नहीं करते हैं और लोगों की जायज मांग को स्वीकार नहीं करते हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि आपका यह रुख प्रजातंत्र के खिलाफ है और लोगों की विल (इच्छा) के खिलाफ जाने का जो एंटीच्युड (रुद्ध) आप अस्तियार करते हैं, उसे मैं एंटीडेमोक्रेटिक (लोकतंत्र विरोधी) मानता हूँ। जब आप लोगों की मांग को स्वीकार नहीं करते हैं तो इसके नतीजे अच्छे नहीं निकलते हैं। अभी आप देखते हैं कि

[श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी]

अतुल चन्द्र घोष हजारां लोगों को ले कर कलकत्ता में मोर्चा लगाने जा रहे हैं। इसी तरह से बम्बई का झगड़ा चल रहा है। अगर आप बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र के साथ नहीं मिलाते हैं और लोगों की विल के खिलाफ जाते हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ आपका यह रवैया अप्रजातंत्रीय है। आप को महाराष्ट्र वासियों की इस मांग को एक न एक दिन स्वीकार करना ही पड़ेगा और जितनी जल्दी आप उनकी इस मांग को मान लेंगे उतना ही अच्छा रहेगा। अगर आप इस डिमांड (मांग) को मान लें तो मैं समझता हूँ आप लोगों के साथ इत्साफ करेंगे। लिहाजा मैं पूरजोर शब्दों में आपसे अपील करता हूँ कि आप बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र में शामिल कर दें। आपके ऐसा न करने से वहाँ के लोगों में ज्यादा बहुत असन्तोष पाया जाता है। उनकी इस जायज मांग को पूरा करना आपका फर्ज है।

3 P. M.

इसी तरह से बहुत से बोर्डर डिसप्यूट्स हैं जिन को तय करना आपका फर्ज है। ये झगड़े बंगाल और बिहार के बीच हैं, बिहार और उड़ीसा के बीच हैं और इसी तरह से दूसरी स्टेट्स के दरम्यान हैं इनको भी प्रजातंत्रीय ढंग से और लोगों की राय लेकर आपको हल करना चाहिये। अगर आप प्लेबिसाइट ले कर इन झगड़ों को हल नहीं कर सकते तो वहाँ की जो पंचायतें हैं, और उनमें जो लोगों के नुमाइंदे हैं, उनकी राय ले कर आप इन झगड़ों का फैसला प्रजातंत्रीय तरीकों से कर सकते हैं।

अब मैं कर्नाटक के सम्बन्ध में दो-चार शब्द कहना चाहता हूँ। कर्नाटक के मसले को जिस तरह से आपने हल किया है, उसपर मैं कुछ हद तक अपना संतोष प्रकट करता हूँ। बेलारी का जो हिस्सा एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट के अनुसार आंध्र को दिया गया था और जिसे अब वापस मैसूर को दे दिया गया है, इसके लिये मैं गवर्नमेंट को बधाई देता हूँ। लेकिन इसके साथ ही साथ एडोर, एडोनी, रायदुर्ग, मरगसिरा को भी, मैं चाहता हूँ कि मैसूर को दे दिया जाये। मैं यह भी चाहता हूँ कि कामुरगोड ताल्लुका, चन्द्रगिरी नदी तक, मैसूर को दे दिया जाये। इसी तरह से शोला-पूर सिटी, साउथ शोलापूर, और अकालकोट जय भी कर्नाटक में अगर मिला दिये जायें तो अच्छा होगा। इसी तरह से और जो छोटे छोटे हिस्से

हैं और जिन के बारे में कोई झगड़ा है, उनका फैसला वहाँ की जनता की राय लेने के बाद कर दिया जाना चाहिये। मैसूर के अन्दर जो कोलार जिला है, उसके अन्दर आंध्र लोग ज्यादा हैं इस वास्ते मैं चाहता हूँ कि उसको आंध्र में मिला दिया जाये, लेकिन इसके बारे में वहाँ के लोगों की राय अगर ले ली जाये तो अच्छा होगा। यहाँ पर जो लोग रहते हैं ज्यादातर तेलुगु बोलते हैं और यही कारण है कि मैं चाहता हूँ कि कोलार को आंध्र में मिलाया जाये।

इन सब बातों का जो बेसिस (आधार) होना चाहिये वह मैं समझता हूँ विल आफ दी पीपल (जनता की इच्छा) होनी चाहिये। अगर लोग चाहते हैं हमें इस स्टेट में मिला दिया जाये आपको चाहिये कि आप उनको इस इच्छा को पूरी करें। मैंने कुछ पेटिशन्स (यचिकायें) आपको भेजी हैं, शोलापुर इत्यादि के बारे में, जिन पर कितने ही लोगों के दस्तखत हैं, और मैं चाहता हूँ कि सिलेक्ट कमिटी (प्रवर समिति) जब इस बिल पर गौर करे तो उनपर भी साथ ही साथ विचार कर ले। जितने भी झगड़े हैं, मैं चाहता हूँ, उनको पीसमील तरीके से हल करने के वजाय आल इंडिया लेवल पर हल किया जाये और जो पालिसी (नीति) एक के बारे में बरती जाये, वही दूसरी के बारे में भी बरती जाये।

अन्त में मैं इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि एस० आर० सी० ने जैसे सिफारिश की है, मैसूर स्टेट का नाम मैसूर न रख कर कर्नाटक रखा जाये और जिसको आपने अब बदल दिया है, वह ठीक नहीं है और इस स्टेट का नाम कर्नाटक ही रखा जाये।

इतना कह कर मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ और मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो बिल पेश किया गया है इसको मैं अपना पूरा-पूरा सहयोग नहीं दे सकता। इसका कारण यह है कि लिक्विडिटी प्रिंसिपल्स के आधार पर कोई ४०-५० वर्ष पहले कांग्रेस ने जो स्टेट्स की रचना की बात कही थी, उस पर वह स्टिक करे (दृढ़ रहे) और ऐसी स्टेट्स कायम करने के लिये कदम उठाये। साथ ही जो छोटे मोटे झगड़े हैं मैं चाहता हूँ, उनको भी मिल-बैठकर और लोगों की राय ले कर हल कर दिया जाये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members have to rise in their seats and catch the eye of the Speaker.

Shri Achuthan (Cranganur): I thought you had a list.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That does not matter. Even then, I have to choose the speaker. I would request hon. Members to rise in their seats.

Shri Achuthan: This Bill is a landmark in the history of this country. Due to historical reasons, during the last 200 or 300 years, or even prior to that, there was no rational reorganisation of the States even though many kings ruled over this country. During the British regime, though they were foreigners, they thought of some reorganisation, but it was not given effect to in all its aspects. The Congress, the political organisation which wanted to see India become independent, had its own ideals. When India became independent, the Congress has necessarily to think not only on the lines in which it was thinking before, but also in the light of actual events, of unifying and solidifying the country. It has got its own experience as a fighting organisation for 40 or 50 years. When the Constituent Assembly was sitting in the Central Hall, they appointed a Committee called the Dhar Committee to examine this question dispassionately. Even some Congress leaders were thinking that linguistic States was a panacea for all ills. So, this Committee was appointed so that a decision could be taken whether Andhra, Karnataka etc. States were to be formed and whether they should find a place even in the Constitution. That Committee went into all the aspects of the question and came to the conclusion that language cannot be the only consideration or even the Number 1 consideration, but it can only be a secondary matter, and that other considerations must prevail. I think this line of thinking was prevailing throughout the length and breadth of the country, not only among the politicians, but also among the people. Then came the J. V. P. Committee. The three leading men of the country, who had the good fortune to have the confidence of the people of the country, came to the conclusion that language cannot be the foremost consideration in the reorganisation of States, but convenience of administration. Even though the J.V.P. report had stated like that, yet the matter did not end there. The feelings of the people were there. As Shri H. N. Mukerjee said, the hunger and thirst were there. Then, in 1953, we saw the formation of the Andhra State. Even though the Prime Minister had stated that the whole question was going to be reviewed, we had the incident of

Potti Sriramulu's death, and soon after, Government decided to form the Andhra State. All this is recent history, and I hope hon. Members might not have forgotten those things.

Even after the formation of the Andhra State, the matter did not end there. There was still agitation in the country. In December 1953, the States Reorganisation Commission was appointed. That commission toured the whole country, took evidence, both oral and written, and interviewed thousands of leading associations, representatives and members, and finally they submitted their report in October last year. From October till 16th January, you know what an amount of turmoil has been there in the country; all sorts of discussions were held, and there were representations made on various aspects, and several views were put forward. All these things were discussed by all sections of the people.

Then, on 16th January, somehow or other, Government decided that States were going to be formed along such and such lines. In pursuance of that decision, we are having this new Bill before us, and I welcome it.

But one thing I have noticed is that even after 16th January, up till this day, people have not come to their senses in thinking as to what we are to do at this juncture. Are we to say even now that language must be the sole consideration for the administrative division of States?

Shri Velayudhan: Do not blame the people. Blame yourself.

Shri Achuthan: If that could be said, why can we not say that religion must be the main consideration? After all, religion will be the strongest tie, and people belonging to one religion may say that they must have one separate State. (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members who want to have their turn to speak here should not interfere in others' speeches.

Shri Achuthan: If that argument can be extended still further, why can we not say that the whole world must be divided into different systems of thought, and each must have have supremacy

[Shri Achuthan]

in its own territory? If language can be taken to that extreme extent, then can there be any logical objection to say that the white people must have so much of territory, and that the black people must have so much? There also, there can be that unity in diversity, and so on.

Therefore, I would say that let us not behave like irrational beings. The one primary consideration, as the Prime Minister has always pointed out, in this democracy of ours that has come into being, is welfare of human feelings. Let us all consider this problem in the light of that aspect. Let all our young men think that they do not belong to one particular linguistic group or religious group only, but that they are all human beings, and that as human beings, they have to live properly in this world, and promote human welfare. It is in that light that I would suggest that let us all put an end to the controversies that have been raging for so long.

Let us take it for granted for a moment that the Bill is passed. Even then, as the Prime Minister has stated on many occasions, there is no finality in a democratic State. I appreciate the Prime Minister's statement. Let people with divergent views, let people who even now hold firmly the view that such and such a portion must be given to them, and that such and such a portion must be given over to some other State, have this picture before them. Let them take this into consideration that there is no finality in a democracy. We can consider the matter coolly and calmly later on. Why should we consider it in a hurry? Why should there be this resort to hartals, demonstrations, etc. to divert the people's attention from the main programme before them, as happened in some other country? We are now going to launch our Second Five Year Plan, and we want the maximum mobilisation of resources for improving the economic standard of our people. At this juncture, are we to distract the people from the Plan on these petty issues, and thus create difficulties in the way of the implementation of the Plan? At a time when we are talking of coexistence and toleration, at a time when we are saying that all nations must settle their disputes peacefully, is this the way in which troubles should be created, and people should start saying, we

must have this portion or that portion and so on? If things are going to happen that way, then what is the guarantee that even the States that are formed in that manner will be stable? If States are going to be formed on the basis of language alone, then they cannot stand together. Anybody can say, no, at any stage, and secede from the rest. Suppose after the Kerala State is formed, the Malayalee people come and say that just like the Naga people, they would like to secede from the rest of the country then what could be the objection to such a thing? I would submit, Sir, that there cannot be any logical explanation for all these things. I very strongly oppose the moves on the part of some persons to divert attention from the Plan. At least, hereafter, we should concentrate more on economic development, and we should think in a united way. I would tell my hon. friends, please do not distract the people, and do not misdirect the people into evil ways. That is what I would like to say by way of introductory remarks.

I find from this Bill that about fifteen States are going to be formed. I am glad to find that as recommended by the States Reorganisation Commission, the differentiation between Part A, Part B and Part C States is being abolished. That is a good sign. Further, the system of Rajpramukhs is also going to be abolished, and it will be soon a story of the past. We are very grateful to the Government of India and to the SRC for having decided that hereafter there will be no distinction between the different States.

Even then, the States will not all be uniform in size. Bigger States like the Uttar Pradesh are going to be there. Are we going to grudge them? There will be bigger States as well as smaller States. So, let us consider things calmly, and let us take measures, to see that the country as a whole is united, not by way of verbal utterances, but by way of common thinking. Let us resort to creative thinking, and let us take to constructive efforts, and let us all feel that we are Indians first, and we are Indians last. Let everyone say, even though I may not know the other languages of the country, but I feel that I am an Indian first, and I am an Indian last. That must be the way in which the leaders of this country should

work, rather than that they should indulge in strengthening small groups this way or that way and thus create more troubles in the country.

In this Bill, I find that there is a new innovation, which has not been recommended by the SRC, namely the formation of the zonal councils. I appreciate the idea. Five zonal councils are going to be formed. I would request the Joint Committee to see whether these zonal councils could be given greater powers.

In this connection, I would like to say that I do not appreciate the way in which the U.P. Chief Minister has spoken about this matter. After the experience that we have had up to the time of the announcement by Government of their decision on 16th January, in all parts of the country, I had expected leading men to come forward and strengthen the bonds of unity, and to adopt methods by which people could be brought together, saying, let us try this experiment. But I am sorry that the U.P. Chief Minister has adopted a different attitude. In today's papers, we find that he is reported to have stated that these zonal councils are a fifth wheel in the coach. What does that statement mean? It is not at all encouraging, that a man of his position should have come and said that these zonal councils are not worth anything, and that they would simply hamper the progress of the States.

Besides the States, we have got also what are called the union territories. So far as the union territories are concerned, what is the forum in which their people could express their opinions? So far as the States are concerned, they have got their own legislatures; and their own systems of administration. When they could have these things, why should not the union territories also be provided with similar things? It may be said that Parliament is supreme, and that the representatives of these union territories will be there in Parliament. But I would suggest that we should devise some method by which even these union territories may have some popular organisations, or some advisory councils, of an elected nature, so that their opinions also may be voiced, and the administration may be directed in such a manner that there will be no strong agitation saying that their views have not been taken into consideration.

I would suggest that the Joint Committee must devise some method for this purpose. For instance, Bombay is going to be a union territory. How can it be said that Bombay is a backward area, and therefore it cannot have a legislative forum in which its people could express their views? I would suggest that in all the union territories, namely Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura and so on, there must be some popular organisations set up where the representatives of the people and their leaders can come and voice their grievances.

Coming to my own State, I understand that at present, there is no Assembly there. But from the Third Schedule, I find that the new Kerala has got only 18 representatives in the House of the People. Government themselves have stated in the draft Bill that according to the following formula, the number of representatives for each State has been fixed:

"The quota for each State in the House of the People has been arrived at by dividing the population of the State by the same general average as was adopted by the former Delimitation Commission (*i.e.* 732,983) and by rounding to the nearest integer."

Even then, I would submit that a mistake has crept in here. Instead of there being 19 representatives, only 18 are seen to be there from Kerala in the Third Schedule. That is a mistake. No argument is needed for this purpose. Mere arithmetical calculation will reveal that there is a mistake in this regard. The population figure has been given by the SRC in their report, and even assuming that the Shencotta taluk is taken away, the population of the new State of Kerala will be 13.6 millions. It can be seen that they are entitled to get 19 members. With regard to Assembly seats, as it is, it has been decided on the basis of 1 to 7. I cannot say that 7 is the most rational criterion or multiple. It can be 8. As was stated by the Home Minister, when the Bill was introduced, let us have more Members. What is the objection? Let the Joint Committee examine this point whether when we have only 18 or 20 from small States, the multiple should be 8 or not. I am not much concerned about that.

[Shri Achuthan]

One thing I have noticed. In the new States that are coming into being, a large number of them have Upper Houses. As against this, even now there is a distinction made. Orissa has not got a Council. Assam has not got a Council. On the other hand, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab and other States have got Councils and are retaining them. Let us have some uniform formula. Either let us have a bicameral legislature or let us have a unicameral legislature. If there is a possibility of having a bicameral legislature, matters can be discussed thoroughly, views can be ascertained, and then we will be in a position to come to a decision. When the Constitution came into being, there was no bicameral legislature in certain States. Now that we are reorganising the States *de novo*, that question must be taken up. The Joint Committee may consider whether it is necessary to have bicameral legislature or unicameral legislature throughout.

I for one would say that for the time being let us have one single legislature. It can be tried. Let us have only one legislature in each State. To say that a big State should have a bicameral legislature and that a small State should have a unicameral legislature does not look very nice. So that question must be considered by the Joint Committee.

This Bill is a very important Bill containing important provisions. The part dealing with apportionment of assets and liabilities is very important. With regard to the new Kerala State, there is no legislature. Even now, many leading men from that State belonging to different parties say that because there is no legislature, it won't be advisable to take up the question of formation now and the division of assets and liabilities. So because there are no leaders of the legislature or Cabinet, special care must be taken by the Central Government to deal with this matter. Care should be taken to see that in the matter of division of assets and liabilities relating to Madras and Kerala, Kerala does not suffer on account of want of a legislature or elected leaders. Serious precautionary steps should be taken to see that Kerala does not suffer by default. This is a very serious matter. On this will depend many other things.

Malabar is going to be joined to Travancore-Cochin. Malabar is an undeveloped area. But we are not going to say that because Malabar is not developed,

we do not like it. It is not from that aspect that I am speaking about Malabar. But every care must be taken to see that this consideration is kept in mind in the division of assets and liabilities and that justice and a proper deal are meted out in that matter.

With regard to the Members of the Rajya Sabha, in the Madras Assembly some objections have been raised. As it is, Kerala is going to have 9 Members in the Rajya Sabha. If it is found that 9 Members can be found in the existing Rajya Sabha, well and good. As it is, in the Bill, Kerala will have the right to elect two more Members to the Rajya Sabha. I think that it is a decision arrived at after due consideration of all aspects by the Government.

Part IX deals with inter-State agreements and other matters. A lot of things are now under construction, electricity, water-supply schemes, multi-purpose projects, road transport e.c. All are intimately inter-connected. If there is any dispute between States regarding this matter which cannot be resolved, then the Central Government will interfere. Well and good, That must be so.

In the division of assets and liabilities, the basis that they have adopted, was the same when the Andhra State was formed, viz., the population basis. We can creditably say that by following that basis there was not much of a hitch. The only workable solution or criterion or yardstick which we can adopt is on the basis of population. It may not be justified if we analyse it in all its details, but it is the only basis we can have. But, as Shri Sivamurthi Swami was saying, particular care must be taken in all these matters. What can we do? It is not a question as if it is to be analysed in a laboratory and the elements found out or census taken out, and then division effected. That cannot be done, that is not possible to be done. So the only reasonable criterion is the population basis; which is the only perceptible criterion which will be appealable to the people concerned.

Coming to services, I am not very clear about what the position is. I find in clause 106(4):

"The cadres of each of the said services for the existing States of Bombay, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab and Vindhya Pradesh and for the existing part B States shall, as from the appointed day, cease to

exist, and the members of each of the said services borne on those cadres shall be allocated to the State cadres of the same service for the other existing States...."

If I understand it properly, the position is this. There are a good number of officers of the all-India services in a particular State. What is the difficulty in retaining them there? Are they to go to other States? This may not be a good practice, though the administration will go on even with a demarcation.

Moreover, with regard to the central services, in the Mysore Assembly a suggestion was made, and I have to congratulate them on that. They said that as regards the central officers drawing higher pay, the Centre should meet that expenditure, the extra pay must be paid by the Centre. That is a good suggestion, because when the States have got their own difficulties in administering their areas, they should not be saddled with the additional burden of having to pay higher pay to the officers concerned, who belong to the all-India services.

Coming to integration of services, I was raising the same question when the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Home Affairs were discussed. Now, we are going to have another process of service integration. Advisory Councils are going to be appointed. When these Advisory Councils are appointed, their duty must be not only to see that integration of services takes place, but to review the integration of services that took place when a State like Cochin was added to Travancore. Whether the policy then adopted was reasonable or not, there is heart-burning among the officers concerned, because even now we get representations from the Cochin area that their cases are not considered. This is an important matter, because unless the services are contented, unless we instil in them that spirit, we may not be able to take the maximum good out of them. Whatever we may do in the Legislative Assemblies or in Parliament, nothing will be achieved unless we keep the services contented. So that point also has to be taken into consideration, and care must be taken to see that Advisory Councils look into this matter. The Joint Committee should also devote its attention to this matter and see if a satisfactory solution cannot be found by adequate provisions. This year 1956 is important because this year we are going to celebrate the 2,500th anniversary of

Lord Buddha. Along with that celebration, in this auspicious year, if we celebrate the passage of this Bill also for the harmonious growth of a common feeling among the Indian people so that there may not be any ill-feeling on account of the fact that people speak this language or that language, it would be good for the country and coming generations.

Shri Vallatharas (Pudukkottai): Having accepted the principle that the States which had been thrown out of the debris of the Moghul Empire and which had been brought into existence by the British rule are now sought to be turned into national arteries of our future Welfare State, there is absolutely no meaning in making subtle distinctions and hair-splitting differences over certain additions of areas or reduction of certain areas. But the Government faces now a very very serious situation. It must stand or fall on one or two issues.

His'ory repeats itself. When Aurangzeb canvassed a mighty empire from Kabul to Chittagong and from Kashmir to Cauvery—(CAUVERY my place)—the whole empire had to crumble because he had to face the Maharashtrians, the Tamilians, the North Indian people. Without understanding the psychological mentalities and aspirations of the various peoples, he wanted to bring them all under one empire. So also, if the Congress Party should think of bringing about an empire of India, though it is a national government without understanding the psychological effects and the aspirations of the various communities, certainly, it will crumble. There is no doubt about it.

Napoleon once said that it was the Spanish Ulcer that ruined him. Allowing history to repeat itself, here the Bombay Ulcer may ruin the present nation. I am decided in my view that Bombay must go to the Maharashtrians unconditionally. I voice forth the deliberate decision of our party, the P.S.P., that Bombay must go to Maharashtra. If you do not give Bombay to Maharashtra now, I can tell my friends that Maharashtra won't get it up for ever. This is my experience of my tour in some places of Maharashtra on an opportunity given by my friend Shri Gadgil. I met workers and leaders of various parties. What is the state of Bombay? The state of Bombay is pitiable; it is "Bleeding Bombay"; it is "wailing Maharashtra". In the neighbourhood it

[Shri Vallatharas]

is resentful and kicking Travancore-Cochin, it is murmuring Tamil Nad and it is dominating U.P. which is a big slice with 85 seats. There is great disparity between this State and the rest of the States. No stability or coherence can ever be maintained in the conception of the Central authority when there are such disparities in size and strength of the several States.

What is the fate of Bombay and what is the fate of Delhi? They are going to be made Union territories. In page 9 of the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill, article 240 reads :

"The President may make regulations for the peace and good government of any Union territory and any regulation so made may repeal or amend any law made by Parliament or any existing law which is for the time being applicable to any such territory and, when promulgated by the President shall have the same force and effect as an Act of Parliament which applies to such territory."

What has led to giving such wide powers to the President even to overrule Parliamentary Acts with regard to these Union territories? Here is Delhi with 16 lakhs of people, consisting of various sections of intelligent men in trade, business etc. There is also Bombay, the Gateway or window of the world. What is the reason to make them just like pocket-boroughs of the President even screening Parliamentary control? This is very odd. I submit that the independence we have gained and the national stability which we have attained cannot, in any event, be allowed to be destroyed or annihilated either by the States that are going to be constituted or by the Central authority which might try to assert itself. So, I would very respectfully submit to this House that Bombay which has got contiguity to Maharashtra should go to Maharashtra. I will trace even the history behind. If you go to the days of the Rashtrakutas and the Chalukyas, you will find that south of Gujerat all the territory belonged to the Maharashtras. I concede the historical fact. Even now, unless there is any special need or necessity for singling out this portion from out of Maharashtra, then, certainly, Bombay should go to Maharashtra. Geographically and even from historical tradition, it is part of Maharashtra. It has been linked up

with Maharashtra culturally and linguistically. Anybody who resisted this had to succumb to its forces. You can subdue it, but you cannot suppress the Maharashtrian spirit. They are valiant and strong; they are a national unit. We cannot discard that. It is under these circumstances that I say that Bombay should go to Maharashtra. I also say that Delhi should never be made a Union territory. These two should never be denied the benefit of a democratic set-up.

An Hon. Member : What about other areas which will become Union territories?

Shri Vallatharas : During the short time at my disposal I will allude only to certain matters.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The other territories will be taken up by other hon. Members.

Shri Vallatharas : In Tamil Nad also there is a feeling against the present Government, whether it is a party government or national government, which is carrying on there. We are not very much worried about Devicolam, Peermede or Shencottah. But, we are concerned with the principle on which these areas were taken from one State and granted to the other. I voice forth the feeling of the Tamilian population. The entire portion of the Devicolam and Peermede should go to Tamil Nad. Any safeguard that Kerala may want can be inserted. There is no question about that in an all-comprehensive India. If they want any protection let them have it. Or else, what is the principle on which an area, with about 76 per cent. of the population who are Tamilians, should be seceded from Tamil Nad and put into Kerala? By seceding this portion from Kerala, is Kerala going to suffer economic deterioration or political disintegration? What else can be apprehended out of that? The feeling of the Tamilians is that the S.R.C. has given a report and that Government need not accept it.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam) : What is your party's view?

Shri Vallatharas : I am Vallatharas' party in Tamil Nad and Tamil Nad party is mine. I do not want to make any distinction here. You cannot separate us. You are my neighbour; you

cannot escape me and I cannot escape you; we are all members of one community.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members should not address each other directly.

Shri Vallatharas: Keralites, the Malabar people, and the Tamilians are all Dravidians. The Andhras and even the Rashtrakutas were all Dravidians. Unfortunately, we have been divided.

An Hon. Member: What about the Maharashtrians?

Shri Vallatharas: They are Dravidians, no doubt; Rashtrakutas were the people from whom the Maharashtrians came.

Even the Moghuls wanted to establish an empire unit of India. It is not as if this is a present strange idea. Even before Christ was born, some 2500 years ago, Chandra Gupta wanted to establish a Mauryan empire and, Ashoka wanted to have an empire. Even Raja Raja Chola afterwards wanted to have a unified empire. We had so many kings having the ideas of unifying India. Aurangzeb was one of those. We have now the experience of the better British rule. Nothing can prevent us from feeling ourselves a national entity, whatever might be our internal differences. So, we will have to patch up all differences by negotiation and persuasion, in such a way that we will have to stick to something, enjoy ourselves and leave to posterity a peaceful era so far as the community is concerned.

I will touch one or two points more. The matter of primary education in the languages of the minorities is provided for in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill. The safeguards for minorities, especially regarding their mother tongue, is envisaged in the fourth part of the S.R.C. Report. I would submit that the Committee may be pleased to study the situation and improve the elements that are stated in it. I find in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill that adequate consideration has not been given to this proposal.

Clause 42 of the present S.R.C. Bill deals with the question of Associates. The Speaker is used to appoint these Associates. He has a conception of the situation and from the people of all

the parties has brought their representations. That is what we presume. But now that power is taken away and the Central Government is going to appoint. On whose advice they are going to appoint? They are not going to ascertain public opinion on the matter. It may be that all the opposition may be eliminated and that Associate members of one party alone may be given preference. This should be avoided. There are certain Members who travel from the blue bed to the brown, from one party to the other—necessitated or not necessitated. Suppose from one opposition group, some Associate members have gone over to the other side, then they should not be counted as opposition party members, but they should be counted as members of the party to which they have gone. When the numerical representation is given to a particular party, it must get a deduction of the associate transferred members. On this basis, the question of associate membership is a very important one, and I would submit that the Committee's attention may deservedly apply to this question.

Regarding the Rajputana State, I should like to submit that special consideration has to be given for it—the political expediency, convenience and strategic advantages. Of course, very recently also, the hon. Home Minister referred to the point that Rajputana should be alert as against the opposing forces on its border. Without Rajputana, the defence of this country cannot properly be established. Of course, there may be other factors, for instance, Punjab, PEPHU and other things. Rajputana's importance is considerable and that was stated long ago by Lord Hastings who gave it as his considered opinion—it was on the principle of political expediency, convenience and strategic advantage. Rajputana's affairs were considered at that time. I would submit to the Committee to enter deeply into this matter and see whether the constitution of the Rajputana State cannot be improved in such a manner that this principle is given the greatest predominance in the formation of it. Economically it may or may not prosper; but, on the other hand, as a strategic part of the defence of this country, all the resources of the rest of the nation have to be applied in making Rajputana highly efficient in the matter of defence.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes) : What is that State now?

Shri Vallatharas : Another thing that I wish to mention is about dispersing revolutionary elements, on the score of more manageable administration. These tactics the Congress must avoid in Travancore-Cochin, where it is impossible, of course, according to our ordinary perception, to get the time-old popularity for the Congress.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem) : The hon. Member may enlighten us where he is reading from.

Shri Vallatharas : He must have some confidence in me. Has he no confidence in me?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : He is consulting his notes much too frequently, but the hon. Member cannot say that he is reading them.

Shri Vallatharas : He is also a Tamilian.

Shri K. K. Basu : The hon. Member does not work on loose slips.

Shri Vallatharas : I believe—it is my personal opinion, subject to correction—that in order to dilute the opposition in Travancore-Cochin, the sudden idea of a merger of Travancore-Cochin with Madras State had started. Apart from other things, for the merger of Telangana with Andhra, that is one of the motives. Tamil Nad cannot, under the present circumstances, ever envisage a merger with Kerala.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam) : Why?

Shri Vallatharas : The reasons are definite. I refer to the JVP Report where it is stated that "some of the linguistic areas, notably the Karnataka and Kerala, have rather suffered in their association with large multi-lingual provinces". This is on behalf of Kerala, but nobody had expressed a word on behalf of Tamil Nad. If you take a subdivision in my district, the inspector is a Malayalee, the sub-collector is a Malayalee, the sub-magistrate is a Malayalee and the lower officials are Malayalees. What are we to do and where are we to go? It is inconceivable as to what we can do. We want employment in our own land, in our own country.

Shri Velayudhan : We do not want to exploit Tamil Nad.

Shri Vallatharas : We are *bona fide* opposed to the merger with Kerala. Kerala itself and suffered long before by remaining in a multi-lingual area. Madras State was formed in 1801 and it has got about 155 years of experience. After long years of remaining together, the Andhras wanted to get out of the group; the Karnatakas wanted to get out of the group; the Keralas have wanted to kick off and go in for Aikya Kerala. We Tamilians resign ourselves to our own lot, without any notice being taken by anybody. Now, why should we be disturbed? Once Shri Rajagopalachari was necessary to get us Madras city and now the present Chief Minister, Kamaraj, deserves praise for preventing the merger. But for Shri Kamaraj certain proposals would have been agreed upon and there would have been great repercussions in Tamil Nad. Some sort of peace is there now. I am glad that the Government has not pressed or proceeded with those merger proposals and that element has not been incorporated in the Bill. I think, for long decades to come the merger of Tamil Nad with any other area may not be conceived for our own benefit. We are not revolutionaries. We are not going to protest against all sorts of authority or upset all sorts of authority; but we only want to get employment in our own sphere, enjoy the resources for ourselves. In the entire districts of Madras State the Malayalees occupy 65 per cent. of the appointments in all cadres. Of course, it is an unjust thing, and so, you must relieve us from this injustice and give us some justice (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : If the House allows me, I will deduct the time that is taken by interruptors when they themselves speak. I am taking a note of it.

Shri K. K. Basu : Those that have no chance of speaking may interrupt then.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : That might make it a permanent record and whenever they stand up, I will note it and not give them a chance.

Shri Vallatharas : So far as Zonal Councils are concerned, the constituent members are given here. I would like to submit that certain Members of Parliament in that area and certain members of the local legislatures also must be made as members in those

Councils. Or else, there will only be a pure official consideration without any relationship with the representatives of the people. Though the Ministers happen to be representatives of the people, once they become Ministers, their colour changes.

The Minister in the Ministry of Communications (Shri Raj Bahadur): Question.

Shri Vallatharas: I do not mean any insinuation against Ministers, because they have to assert whenever people make submissions. When hon. Ministers make observations like "Sensible people will heed to this", the question of discrimination comes in. We have got confidence in them, and they will have to take us also into their confidence. Further, when main decisions are made by the Zonal Councils, they must be made somewhat binding on the State and Central Governments, or else the advisory thing may go without any effect. So, the Committee may consider whether such decisions arrived at by the Zonal Council may be made absolutely binding or binding to some extent on the State and Central Governments. That is a point for consideration. I welcome this reorganisation. I am glad that the Bill, despite its being very mechanical and technical, is bereft of all the emotions that can be attached to it. It envisages a ninety percent reality but is subjected to a drop of poison, which may vitiate the whole pot of milk. So, we should be very careful about Bombay. In respect of Bombay, the policy should not be based on party feelings or such other feelings. Consider the position of the common man calmly and come to a decision at the Joint Committee. The Joint Committee may consider the problem and incorporate an amendment to the Bill that Bombay should go to Maharashtra, and then everybody will be happy.

Shri Mohiuddin (Hyderabad City): Sir, this SRC Bill marks a very great and important step in the history of independent India.

This is the moment when we are passing through a phase of intense economic development. Everyone of us here realises that economic development is of great and vital importance. The standard of living of the common man must have the first priority over all other considerations. At this time, we are also undertaking the internal reorganisation of India on lin-

guistic basis. If we do both together, it will involve a very heavy strain on the people as a whole and also on the Central and State Government departments. In any case, we are taking that risk. I am sure that we will go through it successfully in as short a time as possible.

According to the recommendations of the SRC, Hyderabad State is being disintegrated. The Prime Minister has more than once said that he did not want the disintegration of the State but he has to submit to the recommendations of the SRC or the general demand of the public.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): He said: 'will of the people'.

Shri Mohiuddin: I said 'general demand of the public'; that is the will of the people. Anyhow, the process of disintegration has got to be gone through. But there are important features which we have to examine very carefully and we hope the Joint Committee will do so.

The Bill makes a differentiation between the existing States and the new States. By reading through the explanatory memorandum and the other notes, it is not obvious as to why this distinction has been made. It appears that it is only a legal fiction. I suggest the Joint Committee should consider whether it is desirable to do away with this legal fiction and redraft the clauses in such a way that the necessity for providing for this distinction between a new State and an existing State may not remain any more.

I shall give an illustration.—There are two areas—Telengana area and the Andhra area—and they are now being merged. The Bill provides that certain districts of Telengana will be merged with the existing State of Andhra and the Andhra-Telengana State becomes an existing State. If it is provided, on the other hand, by redrafting the clause that Andhra-Telengana State—whatever name may be given—will be created and the boundaries of the State will be as defined in the schedule, then there will not be any great complications or legal fictions.

It has also been provided in the Bill that the existing outstanding loans will be taken over by the Centre and the concerned States will be responsible for the repayment of the loan amount to the Centre. That will be an internal arrangement. Under this arrangement, the loan, due by the Hyderabad State

[Shri Mohiuddin]

to the public, will be taken over by the Centre and the new State will pay it to the Centre.

[SHRIMATI SUSHAMA SEN *in the Chair*]

It is of great importance that this new State which comes into existence from 1st of October next should, as far as possible, start on a sound financial basis. Taking over of the existing loans will, no doubt relieve the burden on the new State of Andhra-Telangana. But, we read, about two months back, with shock that the Andhra Government had borrowed over Rs. 10 crores or that it had an overdraft account with the Reserve Bank of India for over Rs. 10 crores and that it was not in a position to pay even interest on that account. I am sure that some provision will be made in the proposed Bill to the effect that certain loans which may become a burden on the new State may be funded or consolidated or may be taken over by the Centre. I do not know what kind of overdraft it was. What I am afraid of is this. The new State coming into existence on the 1st of next October will have great difficulties in the matter of development of that area with this burden.

Shri B. S. Murthy : What is the suggestion?

Shri Mohiuddin : The Centre should take over this burden just as it is taking over the existing loans from the existing Hyderabad State and other States. Similarly, this overdraft account may be consolidated and taken over by the Centre so that the burden on the new State will be as little as possible.

The Hyderabad Legislative Assembly has passed a very long resolution suggesting various amendments to the SRC Bill. One suggestion is—and this difficulty arises from the fact that it was treated as an 'existing State'—in regard to the Hyderabad High Court and the Judges. Because the Hyderabad area or Telengana area is being merged in the Andhra State, the Hyderabad High Court is automatically abolished. But there is no provision in the Bill as to what would happen to the Judges of the High Court there. The High Court Judges have a special status.

4 P. M.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram) : They will be well cared for. There is no worry about the Judges.

Shri Mohiuddin : There must be a provision in the Act itself. The High Court Judges have a special status accorded to them in the Constitution of India and an assurance from the Member opposite is not sufficient.

Shri B. S. Murthy : Very unreliable.

Shri Mohiuddin : Very; at least it is not sufficient.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada) : Regarding a High Court at Hyderabad we support you.

Shri Mohiuddin : An amendment has been proposed by the Chief Minister of Hyderabad and accepted by the Hyderabad Legislative Assembly that a definite provision should be made to the effect that even though the High Court of Hyderabad is abolished, the present Judges of the Hyderabad High Court will automatically become the Judges of the Andhra High Court. Of course, I am sure that the Government has thought over the matter and they may provide for the Judges in some other ways, but still we regard it as important that as far as the High Court Judges are concerned, there should not be any doubt as to the continuity of the services which is guaranteed to them by the Constitution of India.

Shri B. S. Murthy : The Andhra High Court has not got the required number of Judges and, therefore, there is no difficulty about the Hyderabad Judges being taken.

Shri Mohiuddin : I hope that Shri B. S. Murthy has grasped the point. When a High Court is abolished, the Judges of that High Court have their services terminated. They may be reappointed, that is a different matter.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha : Sir, I rise on a point of clarification. When the Hyderabad High Court is abolished, according to the provisions of this Bill, the High Court Judges are not abolished. Their services will be continued. That is what I feel.

Shri Mohiuddin : I am afraid I do not agree with Swamiji's interpretation of it. When a High Court is abolished, automatically the services of the Judges are terminated, unless there is also some provision in the clause by which the High Court is abolished, that the existing Judges will be deemed to be the Judges of certain other High Courts.

A provision with regard to the general elections in 1957 and subsequent elections has been made in the proposed Bill. The provision is that the elections in Telangana will be held in 1957 along with the elections to the Parliament, and the general elections in Andhra will be held in 1960 when the election for the members of Telangana will also be held. There is no doubt that we cannot extend the period beyond five years for any Assembly or any part of the Assembly unless the Constitution is amended to that effect. Any provision in the States Reorganisation Bill will not be sufficient. But I do suggest to the Joint Committee that provision should be made in such a way that in 1960 at least or in 1961 or 1962, the general elections for the Assembly as well as for the Parliament are held simultaneously. I do not propose to make any definite suggestion about it. I am only suggesting to the members of the Joint Committee that some provision should be made so that in future simultaneous elections would be held both for the Assembly as well as for the Parliament.

The States Reorganisation Commission had made strong recommendations regarding the language of the minorities. The Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill has a certain clause in it with regard to the protection of the language of the minorities. It provides that President may issue directives for imparting of education in the mother-tongue of the minorities. But I am sure the Joint Committee will also consider what further measures, apart from the provisions in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill empowering the President for issuing directives could be introduced in this Bill. Swami Ramnanda Tirtha had suggested some measures. There are certain other measures which have been proposed by the various amendments which have come from the State Legislatures. I am sure that the Joint Committee will give due thought to these proposals and will provide measures for the protection of the language of the minorities. One of the minority languages is Urdu and in spite of the fact that the States are being formed more or less on linguistic basis, there will be large minorities of one area living in the area of another State.

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी (करनाल) : सभानेत्री महोदया, पहले भी यहां पर कई दिन तक एस० झार० सी० रिपोर्ट (राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग प्रति-

वेदन) पर बात चीत हुई और आज भी इस बिल पर बात चीत हो रही है। मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि इस बिल के कुछ प्राविजनस (उपबन्ध) ऐसे हैं जो कि बहुत रिप्रेजेंटेशनरी (प्रतिक्रियात्मक) हैं और बहुत कुछ देश को और हुकूमत को पीछे ले जाने वाले हैं।

मैं उन टेरिटरीज (प्रदेशों) के बारे में अर्ज करना चाहती हूँ जो कि इस बिल में बनाई जा रही हैं और सेंटर के अन्डर (केन्द्र के अन्तर्गत) में रहेंगी। मुनासिब तो यह होता कि जो टेरिटरीज पिछली दफा बनाई गई थीं जिन को पार्ट सी स्टेट्स (भाग 'घ') में के राज्य कहते थे, उन को कुछ थोड़ी सी पावर्स (शक्तियाँ) ऊपर उठने की दी जायें, मुनासिब यह होता कि यह सोचा जाता कि किस तरह से उन की पावर्स को बढ़ाया जा सकता है कि वह मुनासिब तौर पर काम कर सकें, और उन को बढ़ाया जाता। परन्तु मुझे ताज़ूब हुआ और एक शॉक (घक्का) सा लगा इस बात से कि हम न सिर्फ यह कि वापस चले हैं, बल्कि हम एक घक्का लगा रहे हैं उन एरियाज को जैसे कि ऐडवाइजर्स के जमाने में हुआ करता था।

मुझे याद है दिल्ली में एक ऐडवाइजरी कौंसिल (परामर्श दानो परिषद्) हुआ करती थी जिस के सदस्य हमारी पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर (संसद् सदस्य) श्री कृष्ण नायर हुआ करते थे। एक दिन उन को भारपीट कर हवालात में बन्द कर दिया गया था। वह ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी क्या कर सकती थी और क्या नहीं कर सकती थी, इस बात में मैं इस मौके पर नहीं जाना चाहती। मुझको तो आज यह अर्ज करना है कि बहुत से सभासदों की बात चीत से और यहां पर सभा में बहस के समय में ने इस चीज की महसूस किया कि बहुत कम लोगों का ध्यान इस और है। सब लोग अपनी अपनी स्टेट्स की मुसीबतों और कंट्रोवर्सिज (विवादों) की ओर ध्यान दिला रहे हैं, पार्ट सी स्टेट्स की तरफ उन का ध्यान नहीं है। और अगर कुछ ध्यान है भी तो मजाक में वह कहते हैं कि दिल्ली स्टेट नहीं रही तो बड़ा अच्छा हुआ, मानो यह एक बड़ी हंसी की बात है। मालूम ऐसा होता है कि जब हम दिल्ली की बात करते हैं या और जगहों की बात करते हैं, तो हमारे इस सभा के सभासद यह समझते हैं कि शायद हम दिल्ली के मिनिस्टर्स (मंत्रियों) और सेंटर के मिनिस्टर्स का मुकाबला करते हैं, या यह समझते हैं कि शायद ऐसम्बली (विधान सभा) के मेम्बर्स यहां के सभासदों से मुकाबला

[श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी]

करने का प्रयत्न करते हैं। मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि यह बात सही नहीं है। दिल्ली की जनता क्या, आज सारे हिन्दुस्तान में कोई भी राज्य ऐसा नहीं होगा जहाँ की जनता इस बात को अपनी खुशनुमाई न समझे कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर (प्रधान मंत्री) उस स्टेट के मसलों को हल करें, न आज कोई ऐसा होगा जो यह मानने को तैयार न हो कि हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब अगर अपना काम काज छोड़कर उसकी स्टेट का इन्तिजाम करने लेंगे तो वे बहुत अच्छा इन्तिजाम कर सकेंगे। तो दिल्ली या कोई छोटी स्टेट अपने यहां के मिनिस्ट्रों का और अपने यहां के सभासदों का यहां के मिनिस्ट्रों से और सभासदों से मुकाबला नहीं कर सकती। लेकिन साथ ही यह बात भी सोचने की है कि यह बात भी ज़रूरी नहीं है कि जो मेम्बर यह पार्लियामेंट में आते हैं वे राज्यों के बंस्ट (सर्वोत्तम) आदमी आते हैं। हमने यह भी देखा है कि यहां ऐसे भी लोग आते हैं जिनसे कि राज्यों के लोग अपना पीछा छुड़ाना चाहते हैं, या कोई सताने वाला होता है तो उसको यहां भेज दिया जाता है यह सोच कर कि यहां दोनों सदनों के सदस्यों की संख्या ७५० है और इसमें आ कर वह खो जायेगा। तो मुकाबला करने का तो कोई सवाल नहीं है। लेकिन मैं दिल्ली की जनता का उत्तर प्रदेश या किसी और राज्य की जनता से मुकाबला करना चाहती हूँ और कहना चाहती हूँ कि दिल्ली की जनता को भी वैसे ही शिकायतें और मसले हैं जैसे कि दूसरे राज्यों के हैं। और राज्यों की जनता की तरह से दिल्ली की जनता को भी रोना और हंसना आता है। यही हाल और सी० स्टेट्स में भी है।

मैं देखती हूँ कि जिन स्टेट्स में म्युनिसिपल कमिटीज हैं, कारपोरेशन (निगम) हैं और असम्बलीज भी हैं, जहां पर कि वह दिन रात तरह तरह के सवाल करते हैं, लेकिन फिर भी उन स्टेट्स के मेम्बर पार्लियामेंट भी यहां उन मामलों के बारे में बराबर प्रश्न करते हैं और उनको फिर भी सन्तोष नहीं होता। यद्यपि हमारे स्पीकर (अध्यक्ष) कहते हैं कि यह सवाल इर्रैलेंट (असंगत) है, ये सवाल स्टेट्स से सम्बन्ध रखते हैं, फिर भी यहां के सभासद अपनी अपनी स्टेट्स के बारे में यहां सवाल करते हैं। इससे भी उनको सन्तोष नहीं होता और जब यहां पर बजट की या किसी और चीज की बहस होती है तो उसमें भी उन सवालों का जिक्र करते हैं।

मैं अर्ज करना चाहती हूँ कि पार्ट सी० स्टेट्स और दूसरी स्टेट्स में क्या अन्तर है। कुछ साल पहले हमने पार्ट सी० स्टेट्स को असम्बलीज दीं, लेकिन उनको बहुत कम पावर्स दीं। ज़रूरत इस बात की थी कि हम उन पावर्स को बढ़ाते और जो उनमें कमजोरी थी उसको दूर करते। मैं यह नहीं कहती कि यहां के सभासद हमारे मामलों को हल नहीं कर सकते लेकिन मेरा कहना यह है कि यहां के सभासदों को इतना अवकाश नहीं कि वे हमारी छोटी छोटी बातों पर ध्यान दें सकें। यहां पर न सिर्फ सारे हिन्दुस्तान के मसले तै होते हैं बल्कि इंटरनेशनल (अन्तर-राष्ट्रीय) मसले भी हल किये जाते हैं। इसलिये यह सम्भव नहीं है कि यहां के सदस्य या मंत्री इस बात पर ध्यान दें सकें कि दिल्ली की किसी गली या कूचे में किसी को क्या शिकायत है। तो मेरे कहने का मतलब सिर्फ यही है कि आप यहां की छोटी छोटी चीजों पर ध्यान नहीं दे सकते।

मैं फिर कहना चाहती हूँ कि दिल्ली के मिनिस्ट्रों का यहां के मिनिस्ट्रों से मुकाबले का कोई सवाल नहीं है। लेकिन यहां के मिनिस्ट्रों के पास बक्त कहां है। अगर यह कहा जाये कि यहां के मिनिस्टर हमारी शिकायतों को देखेंगे तो ज़रूर हम इसका स्वागत करेंगे, लेकिन ऐसा नहीं हो सकता और मुझे डर है कि हमारा भी वही हाल हो जायेगा जो दूसरे सेंट्री एडमिनिस्ट्रिड एरियाज (केंद्र प्रशासित क्षेत्रों) का है जहां का काम अफसरों की मेहरबानी पर चलता है।

कभी-कभी दिल्ली की भी कुछ बातें, जैसे इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट की या हेल्थ की यहां हमारे सामने आती है। श्रीमती जॉर्डिस (पीलिया) के बारे में यहां जिक्र आया था। इन चीजों में यहां के सभासद दिलचस्पी लेते हैं। इसी तरह से आप देखें तो आपको और महकमों की शिकायतें भी दिखायी दे सकती हैं लेकिन मैं कहती हूँ कि यहां किसी को इतना अवकाश ही नहीं है। आप दिल्ली पुलिस के रिकार्ड को देखें। यहां यह हाल है कि जो पिटता है और जो शिकायत करता है वह जेल में जाता है। पर किसी की तबज़्जह इस तरह नहीं जाती। श्रीमती आपने उस दिन देखा कि जब यहां पर मारपीट हुई हमारे यहां के एक सभासद ने यहां आ कर कहा कि आठ आदमी मारे गये। लेकिन कोई आदमी नहीं मारा गया था। इससे स्पष्ट है कि उस सभासद को इतनी दिलचस्पी नहीं थी कि वे वहां जा कर इस बात की तहकीकात

करते और मालूम करते कि वास्तविकता क्या है। उस सभासद की यहां पर इस गलत खबर के लिए हंसी की गयी। मैं कहती हूँ कि यह हंसी करने की बात नहीं थी। मैं पूछती हूँ कि यहां कितने सभासद हैं जिन्होंने कि बाद में जा कर इस चीज की जांच की हो कि यह क्या चीज थी और गो कि आठ आदमी नहीं मार गये, पर आखिर शिकायत क्या थी। किसी ने उस मसले को स्टडी (अध्ययन) करने की कोशिश नहीं की। तो मैं सिर्फ यह अर्ज करना चाहती हूँ कि यहां मुकाबले का कोई सवाल नहीं है, बात यह है कि यहां के सभासदों और मिनिस्टर्स को दिल्ली की शिकायतों में जाने का अवकाश ही नहीं है। इसीलिये मैं चाहती हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में सात-सात सेंट्री एडमिनिस्ट्रंड एरियाज न हों जहां कि आफिसर्स की हुकूमत हो जैसी कि पुराने जमाने में हुआ करती थी।

दूसरी बात मुझे यह अर्ज करनी है कि दिल्ली के बारे में यह डिमांड (मांग) कोई नई नहीं है। सन् १९१८ से इंडियन नेशनल कांग्रेस (भारतीय राष्ट्रीय कांग्रेस) की यह डिमांड चली आ रही है कि दिल्ली में इस किस्म की हुकूमत होनी चाहिये कि जिसमें दिल्ली की जनता की अधिकार हो। उसके बाद राउंड टेबिल कानफरेंस (गोल मेज सम्मेलन) में भी किसी वक्त इस चीज की मांग की गयी। सन् १९४७ में पर्ट्यामि कमेटी ने भी इसकी सिफारिश की। उसके बाद हमने दिल्ली को कुछ अधिकार दिये।

दूसरी चीज मुझे यह अर्ज करनी है कि एक वक्त यह आवाज उठी कि दिल्ली बढ़नी चाहिये। एक महा दिल्ली होनी चाहिये। लेकिन वह नाम ही ऐसा था जिससे लोग चौंक जाते हैं। पर मैं चाहती हूँ कि सिलेक्ट कमेटी इस बात पर गौर करे कि जिस वक्त दिल्ली का प्राविस (प्रान्त) बनाया गया था उस वक्त दिल्ली की आबादी २ लाख ३२ हजार के करीब थी। आज दिल्ली की आबादी २० लाख के करीब है। मुझ को तो ताजुब हुआ और कुछ हंसी भी आई कि ए० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट में देश की क्रिस्म का फीसला करने वालों ने जब यह कहा कि अगर दिल्ली के साथ नजदीक के कुछ गांव रखने जरूरी समझे जाय तो वह रखे जाय और बगैर जरूरत के वापिस कर दिये जाय। जब दिल्ली बनी थी उस वक्त यहां की आबादी केवल २ लाख थी जब कि आज यह बढ़ कर २० लाख हो गई है और इस हालत में भी उनका

खयाल है कि जो आसपास के गांव जरूरी न हों वह दिल्ली से बाहर कर दिये जाय। मुझे तो उन महानुभावों के ऐसा कहने पर ताजुब मालूम होता है और मैं समझती हूँ कि उन्होंने इस समस्या पर काफी गौर नहीं किया और बड़ी लापरवाही से रिपोर्ट पेश कर दी है। उन्होंने यहां के मसलों को समझने की कोशिश नहीं की है और अगर वह ठीक से समझे होते तो वे यह कहते कि जितने जरूरी हों, उतने और ले लिये जाय और दिल्ली में ऐड (जोड़) कर दिये जाय और यह सवाल नहीं उठाते कि जितने जरूरी न हों, उतने वापिस कर दिये जाय।

आज हमारे सामने दिल्ली को बड़ा बनाने का सवाल नहीं है। आज मालूम होता है कि दिल्ली छोटी हो गई है। दिल्ली हम बड़ी बनाने नहीं जा रहे हैं बल्कि हकीकत यह है कि दिल्ली २० लाख निवासियों को बसाने के लिये छोटी पड़ गई है और आज की जरूरत के लिहाज से उसको एक्सपेंड (विस्तार) करने के लिये और उसकी तरक्की और डेवलपमेंट (विकास) करने के लिये जितना एरिया उसमें और मिलाना जरूरी मालूम पड़े, उसके मिलाने के लिये हमको गौर करना चाहिये।

दिल्ली के मौजूदा प्रजातंत्री ढांचे को कायम रखने के विरुद्ध यह कहा गया है कि दिल्ली एक छोटी सी स्टेट है और वहाँ का डेमोक्रेटिक सेट अप (प्रजातान्त्रिक व्यवस्था) बहुत मंहगा पड़ता है और यह भी कहा गया कि उन चार स्टेट्स को जिनको कि सेंटर को ज्यादा से ज्यादा रुपये की मदद देनी पड़ती है और वह मदद १० रुपये पर कैपिटा (प्रति व्यक्ति) पड़ती है और दिल्ली उनमें से एक स्टेट है जिसको कि यह मदद सेंटर से मिलती है। मैं फ्रीगर्स (आंकड़ों) के मामले में अपने को बहुत एक्सपर्ट (विशेषज्ञ) तो नहीं मानती हूँ लेकिन डरते डरते थोड़ा कोट करना चाहती हूँ और बतलाना चाहती हूँ कि १० रुपये पर कैपिटा की मदद दिल्ली स्टेट के बारे में ठीक नहीं है। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहती हूँ कि सन् १९५२-५३ में दिल्ली की ५ लाख २५ हजार रुपये की ग्रांट (अनुदान) दी गई, ५३-५४ में १४ लाख ४० हजार की मदद की गई और यह जो मदद है, यह ५ आने पर कैपिटा पर ईयर (प्रति वर्ष) से भी कम मालूम पड़ती है। मैं समझती हूँ कि जिस तरह ए० और बी० क्लास की स्टेट्स को इनकमटैक्स (आयकर) और एक्साइज ड्यूटी (चुंगी शुल्क) मिलती है अगर दिल्ली को उसी तरीके से मिल जाय

[श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी]

करे तो दिल्ली की इनकम इतनी होती है कि वह अच्छी तरह से अपना इंतजाम कर सकती है। दिल्ली के खारी बावली के बाजार में इतना बिज़नेस (व्यापार) होता है कि बहुत बड़ी बड़ी स्टेट्स से वह मुक्ताबला कर सकती है और अगर दिल्ली को कहीं वह हिस्सा दिया जाये जिस तरीके का कि इनकम टैक्स और एक्साइज ड्यूटी दूसरी ए० और बी० स्टेट्स को दी जाती हैं तो वह मज़े से खुद अपना काम चला सकती है।

एक बात यह भी कही गई कि छोटी सी स्टेट है जहाँ इतने बड़े बड़े लोग दिल्ली में रहते हैं, कभी किसी की तस्वीर नहीं आती है, फोटो नहीं आता है, फिर दिल्ली के मिनिस्टर किस गिनती में आते हैं तो उसके बारे में मुझे कुछ ख़ास नहीं कहना है। वैसे में यह बतला दूँ कि क़रीब क़रीब रोज़ दिल्ली के मिनिस्टर का नाम आता है और उनके कार्यों का जिक्र रहता है।

यह कहा जाता है कि इतनी ज़रां सी दिल्ली क लिये इतनी बड़ी असम्बली हो और जहाँ कि मिनिस्टरों का लो० १-१ हजार रुपये की तनख्वाह ल ठीक नहीं है और दिल्ली के लोगों को डेमोक्रेसी बहुत मंहंगी पड़ती है। मैं अदब से अर्ज करना चाहती हूँ कि मुझ को पार्लियामेंट का मुक्ताबला असम्बली से नहीं करना है लेकिन इतना ज़रूर कहूँगी कि देश के लिये हमने पार्लियामेंटरी डेमोक्रेसी (संसदीय प्रजातंत्र) को माना है और यहाँ सेंटर में हमने दो हाउस (सदन) बनाये और मेम्बरों के लिये काफ़ी हमने भत्ता भी निश्चित किया और एक दफ़ा हाउस के मिलने पर यहाँ पर काफ़ी पैसा खर्च होता है और इसके अलावा सेलेक्ट कमेटीज की मीटिंग्स होती रहती हैं और मेम्बरस उसमें भाग लेते हैं और एक दिन की मीटिंग एटेंड करने के लिये तीन, चार रोज़ का भत्ता लेते हैं। जाहिर बात है कि डेमोक्रेसी काफ़ी मंहंगी पड़ती है लेकिन हमने जान बूझकर पार्लियामेंटरी डेमोक्रेसी को अपने देश के वास्ते चुना है और मैं समझती हूँ कि मुझ को और हममें से ज्यादातर लोगों को ज्यादातर वक्त सेंट्रल हाल में काफ़ी पी कर गुज़ारना होता है....

एक माननीय सदस्य : काफ़ी मुफ्त नहीं मिलती है।

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : मुझे अर्ज करना है कि अगर हम कोशिश भी करें कि जितने टोपिक्स (विषयों) में हमारी दिलचस्पी है

उनके बारे में अगर हम अपने विचारों को रखना चाहें तो हम नहीं रख सकते हैं, इतना वक्त ही नहीं मिल सकता है। पांच साल में अगर हर एक मेम्बर कोशिश करे कि मैं इतने सब्जेक्ट्स (विषयों) पर बोलूँ और अपने विचार रखूँ तो नहीं रख सकता है यह चीज़ बिलकुल साफ़ है कि डेमोक्रेसी काफ़ी मंहंगी होती है लेकिन हम डिक्टेटरशिज़ (तानाशाही) के तरीके को चलत समझते हैं। यह जो आप दिल्ली को सेंट्रली एडमिनिस्टर्ड करने की बात कहते हैं तो वह तो ब्यूरोक्रेसी (नौकरशाही) के ज़रिये रूल करना हुआ और मैं अदब से अर्ज करूँगी कि अगर हमने ऐसा महसूस किया हो कि डेमोक्रेसी हमारे यहाँ फ़ैल (असफल) हो गयी है तो अकेले दिल्ली में ही क्यों आप और स्टेट्स में भी इसको लागू कर सकते हैं और उन पर भी इस डेमोक्रेसी के खर्च के भार को क्यों डालते हैं? उत्तर प्रदेश में आटे पर टैक्स लिया गया और हम देख रहे हैं कई जगहों पर कॉन्सिन्टर हारती जा रही है और आपस में लड़ाई झगड़े भी होते हैं, दिल्ली में भी होते थे और आज बाहर भी होते हैं, लेकिन इसका मतलब यह नहीं कि वहाँ डेमोक्रेसी के सिस्टम (प्रणाली) को खत्म कर दिया जाये। मैं समझती हूँ कि इस बिल में कोई प्रपोज़न (अनुपात) नहीं है क्योंकि इसके मुताबिक छोटी टेरिटरी नहीं रह सकती है लेकिन यू० पी० जितनी बड़ी टेरिटरी रह सकती है। इसके अलावा मेरा निवेदन है कि इस तरह के मामलों में आगे बढ़ने से पहले जनता की राय लेनी चाहिये और जनता को अपनी स्वतंत्र राय को प्रकट करने का अवसर देना चाहिये और मैं समझती हूँ कि इस तरह का डेमोक्रेटिक राइट (प्रजातांत्रिक अधिकार) जो दूसरी स्टेट्स को दिया गया है वह दिल्ली की जनता को भी प्राप्त होना चाहिये था। अगर हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह खयाल है कि डेमोक्रेसी यहाँ फ़ैल हो रही है तो मैं कहूँगी कि उसको बाकी हिन्दुस्तान के दूसरे हिस्सों से भी हटा देना चाहिये और मैं समझती हूँ कि यहाँ केन्द्र में ऐसे बड़े बड़े वजीर हैं जो कि बहुत योग्य हैं और उन पर ही सारे देश भर पर हुकूमत करने का भार सौंप दिया जाये।

श्री नंद लाल शर्मा :

नमोऽस्तु रामाय सलक्षमणाम

देव्यै चतस्र्यै जनकामजायै ।

नमोऽस्तु रुद्रेन्द्रायमानिलेभ्यो

नमोऽस्तु चन्द्रार्कमरुदग्णेभ्यः ॥

सभानेत्री महोदया, इस राज्य पुनःसंघटन विधेयक में एक नया अर्थ प्रतिपादक शब्द राज्य पुन-विगठन विधेयक भी देखने में आ रहा है।

अभी मूझ से पहले एक माननीय सदस्यों दिल्ली के लिये जो उनके मन में भाव थे उनको रखते हुए वे रो पड़ीं और मैं समझता हूँ कि दिल्ली के बारे में जो केंद्रीय सरकार कदम उठाने जा रही है उससे उनके दिल को बहुत सदमा पहुंचा है। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि जिन प्रदेशों से वक्ता अभी बोले नहीं हैं, चाहे वह विन्ध्य प्रदेश के हों, मध्य भारत के हों, चाहे वे बम्बई के क्षेत्र के हों, उनके दिलों में वेदना छिपी पड़ी है क्योंकि उनका घर बिगड़ रहा है, अलबत्ता जिनका कि घर बंद रहा है उनको प्रसन्नता है। जिनका कि घर बिगड़ रहा हो, उनको अपने घर के टूटने का दर्द न हो, ऐसा हम नहीं कह सकते। वैसे, तो सभानेत्री महोदया, सारा हिन्दुस्तान मेरा है और “वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्” सारी पृथ्वी हमारी है, अन्ततोगत्वा सारा ब्रह्मांड हमारा है और अनगिनत कोटि ब्राह्मांड मेरे हैं, लेकिन यह कह कर अपने तत्व को खो देना यह भी मूर्खता का लक्षण है, इसलिये अपने घर को भी पहचानना चाहिये केवल कास्मो-पोलिटियन (सर्व देशीय) बनने के जोम में अपनी लिमिट्स (सीमाओं) को खो देना, यह हमारे भारतीय नेताओं में एक बीमारी आ गई है और उसका फल यह भोग रहे हैं। जैसा कि हमारे गृह मंत्री महोदय ने आज संकेत दिया कि शत्रु बाहर से जिहाद की आवाज लगा रहा है और आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हमको संगठित हो कर राष्ट्र के निर्माण के लिये आगे बढ़ना चाहिये मैं उस धारणा का स्वागत करता हूँ और भारत की सुरक्षा और उसकी स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा के लिए यदि भारत का एक एक बच्चा भी बलिदान कर दिया जाय तो मुझे उसके लिये जरा भी कष्ट नहीं होगा और अगर हम लोगों का जीवन अपने राष्ट्र की रक्षा के लिये काम नहीं आयेगा तो फिर किस काम आयेगा।

मुझे एक बात का खेद है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय के मुख से काश्मीर के उस भाग के लिए जिसके कि ऊपर शत्रु ने अनधिकृत रूप से कब्जा किया हुआ है और जिस काश्मीर के भाग की ओर एक एक चप्पा भूमि में से शत्रु

को खदेड़ कर स्वतंत्र कराने के लिये प्रतिज्ञाबद्ध था उसके सम्बन्ध में आज बिना पार्लियामेंट से परामर्श किये हुए उन्होंने उस भाग को शत्रु के हाथ में सरेंडर (समर्पण) कर देने की बात कही है और जिसका कि फल उनको यह भोगना पड़ रहा कि वह शत्रु उनका और विरोध करता चला जा रहा है। चाहिये तो यह था कि यदि हम राज्य पुनर्गठन करते हैं तो हम पहले देश का पुनर्गठन करें, राष्ट्र का पुनर्गठन करें। राष्ट्र का पुनर्गठन करने के लिये उन सारी विघटित शक्तियों को जो कि देश और राष्ट्र को कमजोर बनाने वाली हैं पहले हटावें। लेकिन आज हम उस के बदले उन को बना कर और पनपाने का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं।

मैं पंजाब की ओर जरा ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। मैं ने प्रातः काल भी “नो” शब्द कहा था। लेकिन उस “नो” में ऐसी भावना नहीं थी कि मुझे गृह मंत्री महोदय की भावनाओं से मतभेद है। बल्कि सारे के सारे बिल के बारे में जो कि आप ने सदन में रखा है, उसके दृष्टिकोण में भेद है। केवल एक नियम बांध कर के किसी भी प्रकार से हम साम्प्रदायिक शक्तियों को पनपाने नहीं देंगे, आज कांग्रेस दल ने कुछ साम्प्रदायिक संस्थाओं के साथ मिल कर के पंजाब के ७५ फी सदी नहीं तो कम से कम ७२ या ७३ प्रतिशत व्यक्तियों पर उन की इच्छा के विरुद्ध एक भावना लादने का प्रयत्न किया है। इस को स्वयम् हमारे गृह मंत्री अनुभव करते हैं और मैं भी अनुभव करता हूँ कि जो एक मात्र दल महा पंजाब की मांग करता था उन को हम ने कॉन्फिडेंस (विश्वास) में नहीं लिया, उन से किसी प्रकार का विचार विमर्श नहीं किया गया, उन से कोई बात चीत नहीं की गई। मेरा महा पंजाब दल के साथ कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है, परन्तु मैं कहूंगा कि मेरा कहना उस जनता के लिये है जिस ने हिन्दी भाषा को अपनी भाषा बनाया है और जिस जनता ने हिन्दी भाषा का राष्ट्र-भाषा के रूप में सम्मान बढ़ाया। उस जनता के उपर जिसने जीवन भर में कभी गुरुमुखी लिखी नहीं, जबदेस्ती गुरुमुखी अक्षरों के लादने का प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है। यद्यपि इस विधेयक के अन्दर वह अंश नहीं है, लेकिन जोन के बारे में पंजाब के जो विभाग किये जाने वाले हैं यदि उन का रूप आप के सामने या प्रवर समिति के सामने उपस्थित हो तो मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि आप और वह इस ओर ध्यान दें। पंजाब का बटवारा और आगे नहीं होना चाहिये, पंजाब

[श्री नंद लाल शर्मा]

और जोन्स में नहीं बांटना चाहिये। वहां पंजाबी भाषा को अवश्य उन्नत बनाया जाये, पंजाबी भाषा को पूर्ण सुरक्षा हो इस की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये परन्तु साथ में उन लोगों के ऊपर गुरुमुखी लिपि न लादी जाये जो स्वयं उस को अपनी लिपि नहीं मानते।

साथ ही साथ मुझे हिमाचल प्रदेश के सम्बन्ध में दो शब्द कहने हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा की कारवाई को देखते हुए मुझे कितने ही सदस्यों द्वारा ऐसे संशोधन मिले जिन में कहा गया था कि हिमाचल प्रदेश को उत्तर प्रदेश में मिला देना चाहिये। देहरादून, टेहरी गढ़वाल और हिमाचल प्रदेश को एक कर दिया जाये। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह एक बड़ा खतरनाक मूव है। हिमाचल प्रदेश शिमला से ले कर कुल्लू वैली तक, सारे का सारा क्षेत्र पंजाब का अंग है और पंजाब के साथ मिलता है। उस की भौगोलिक स्थिति भी उस को पंजाब के साथ ही रखती है, इस लिये उस को कभी भी पंजाब से विलग न किया जाये और उस का पंजाब में मिलना आवश्यक है।

राजस्थान के सम्बन्ध से मुझे इस विधेयक का स्वागत करना है। मैं अपने अजमेर के बन्धुओं का स्वागत करता हूँ क्योंकि अजमेर के बन्धुओं ने भी इस का स्वागत किया।

श्री बी० डी० पांडे (जिला अल्मोड़ा उत्तर-पूर्व) : कुछ तो अक्ल आई।

श्री नंद लाल शर्मा : मैं आप का धन्यवाद करता हूँ कि आप ने यह स्वीकार तो किया, कुछ अक्ल मुझे आई और मैं समझता हूँ कि आप के मन में भी यह भावना कुछ है कि विरोधी को भी कुछ अक्ल होनी चाहिये। राजस्थान में मन्दसोर का एक छोटा सा इलाका मिलाया गया है, बाकी का सारे का सारा हिस्सा वहां से हटा दिया गया हालांकि मन्दसोर क्षेत्र के निवासी श्री त्रिवेदी स्वयं कहते रहे कि वह सारे का सारा राजस्थान से मिला ही दिया गया है। मुझे मध्य भारत के विघटन का खेद है। मैं अपने सामने माननीय श्री काटजू को देखता हूँ, उन को अधिक खेद होना चाहिये था किन्तु शायद उन्होंने जनता की ओर से कुछ कहना अभी उचित नहीं समझा। और अगर उचित समझा हो तो हो सकता है कि वह अनुशासन के कारण यहां कुछ न कुछ कह सकते हों। मैं मध्य भारत क्षेत्र में घूमा हूँ और वहां की जनता का असन्तोष मैंने स्वयं अपने कानों से सुना है तथा अपने

नेत्रों से देखा है। इसी प्रकार मैं विध्य प्रदेश में भी घूमा हूँ, वहां की जनता का असन्तोष भी मैंने देखा और हमारे गृह मंत्री महोदय को भी उस का अच्छी तरह अनुभव है। उस का प्रदर्शन भी मैंने एक भयंकर रूप में देखा है। बम्बई के सम्बन्ध में बहुत कुछ कहा जा चुका परन्तु मेरा स्पष्ट कहना है कि सिवा इस के कि महाराष्ट्र के निवासी गरीब हैं, उन के पास अधिक धन नहीं है, वह अधिक प्रलोभन नहीं दे सकते हैं, और कोई कारण नहीं है कि बम्बई क्षेत्र से उस को वंचित रखा जाये। इस के सम्बन्ध में तर्क दिये जा चुके हैं, और इतना समय नहीं है कि उन को और बढ़ा कर कहूँ, लेकिन मेरा यह विश्वास है कि बम्बई किसी न किसी समय, जब तक मराठे वहां रहते हैं, और थोड़ी संख्या में नहीं रहते हैं, अधिक से अधिक संख्या में रहते हैं, महाराष्ट्र में मिल कर रहेगा। कोई बम्बई को उस से छीन नहीं सकता। आप को उसे महाराष्ट्र में मिलाना ही पड़ेगा।

एक दो शब्द मैं आप की जोनल कौंसिल (प्रादेशिक परिषदों) अथवा जोनल सिस्टम (प्रादेशिक प्रणाली) के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि जोनल कौंसिल को जो जगह दी जा रही है उस में मुझे पार्लियामेंट या केंद्र का कोई सम्बन्ध उस से नहीं दीखता। एक जगह पर केवल धारा २० के दूसरे भाग में दिया हुआ है :

"The administrative expenses of the said office, including the salaries and allowances payable to or in respect of members of the secretarial staff of the Council other than the Secretary, shall be borne by the Central Government out of monies provided by Parliament for the purpose."

इस के अतिरिक्त कहीं भी नहीं है कि उस की कोई भी प्रोसीडिंस (कार्यवाही का विवरण) पार्लियामेंट के सामने आयेंगी या नहीं, या पार्लियामेंट का उस से क्या सम्बन्ध होगा या पार्लियामेंट का कोई सदस्य उस में होगा या नहीं। अर्थात् जोनल कौंसिल में कहीं पर भी डिमाक्रेसी का कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। ऐसी परिस्थिति में जब कि आप की बनाई हुई डिमाक्रेसी और प्रजातंत्र के सिद्धांतों पर बनी हुई विधान सभायें और उन के ऊपर बनने वाली यह कौंसिल और वह कौंसिल जिन में डिमाक्रेसी का नाम तक नहीं, वह किस प्रकार

से एक दूसरे के साथ मेल खा सकेंगी और किस प्रकार की गवर्नमेंट खड़ी करेगी। जैसा मेरे मित्र श्री देशपांडे जी ने कहा, हो सकता है यह छोटी छोटी गवर्नमेंट्स फिर खड़ी कर दें। इस लिये मेरा फिर निवेदन है कि प्रवर समिति और हमारे मंत्री महोदय इस बात पर भी ध्यान दें।

इतना निवेदन अन्त में मैं अवश्य करूंगा कि जम्मू और काश्मीर की समस्या पर विशेष ध्यान दिया जाय। न केवल जम्मू और काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में बल्कि बंगाल, आसाम और उड़ीसा के सम्बन्ध में भी यह विधेयक सर्वथा मूक सा ही है और उन के अन्तर्गत जो क्षेत्र हैं उन के बटवारे के सम्बन्ध में भी यह विधेयक बहुत प्रश्नों में मूक ही है। हो सकता है कि हमारे गृह मंत्री का पुनः उस के सम्बन्ध में संशोधन लाने का प्रोग्राम हो, परन्तु चाहिये तो यह था कि इस विधेयक को जितना पूर्ण बनाया जा सके, उतना बनाया जाय।

Shri A. K. Dutt - (Calcutta South-West): I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on this States Reorganisation Bill.

In the draft copy of the States Reorganisation Bill, I do not find any provision for implementing the suggestions made in the S.R.C. report which has been accepted by the Cabinet with certain modifications. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons annexed to S. R. Bill, it is stated :

"In view of the proposal for the amalgamation of Bihar and West Bengal which is under consideration, no provision has been made in this Bill for any territorial adjustments between these two States."

I do not agree with that view. Whether there is amalgamation or union of the two States or not, there will be necessity for demarcation of the boundary line between these two States. The formation of the union or amalgamation is in the negotiation stage. Some of the terms of the said negotiation are that there will be a right of secession, and that there will be regional councils. Unless the boundaries of the two States are demarcated, it will be difficult to implement those provisions. Under these circumstances, whether there is union of the two States or not, it will be necessary to implement the suggestion of the

SRC with the modification that has been made by the Cabinet. If that is not done, then the anti-union party will create difficulties for us. Those who are against the union or merger are already making propaganda that this union is a mere subterfuge to avoid meeting out the small justice to West Bengal shown in S.R.C. Report. I would therefore suggest that unless the SRC recommendations are implemented with the modification made by the Cabinet, in the present mood of the people of the West Bengal, it will be difficult for us to support the union of Bihar and Bengal and to convince the people of the utility of such union.

The Indian National Congress had declared year after year that after the achievement of Independence, all the provinces of India will be divided on a linguistic basis. They had also conceded that the then existing divisions had not been made on that basis, but that the foreigners had made such divisions for their own political purposes and for their own administrative reasons. Therefore, they had said that it would be necessary to divide India on the linguistic basis and to bring the people speaking the same language together, after the attainment of Independence.

After Independence, there was an agitation for this division. Then, the SRC was appointed. The State of West Bengal also put its claim before the SRC, claiming the territories of Manbhum, Dalbhum and various adjacent areas along the border of West Bengal. The SRC after going into the matter deeply did not, however, allow the claim of Bengal on the linguistic basis. They suggested that Bengal may have about 4,000 square miles of land from Manbhum and Purnea district for other reasons. But West Bengal did not consider that satisfactory enough. So there were Statewide hartals, and there was a lot of agitation. Ultimately, the Matter was taken up by a high-powered committee consisting of important members of the Cabinet. After going into the matter deeply, that committee decided that West Bengal should get the land suggested by the SRC report, less about 500 square miles situated near about the Tata Iron and Steel Works. This was very much resented to by the people of West Bengal. They were in an agitated and resentful mood.

It was at this stage that the proposal for the merger of Bihar and Bengal came in, and the Roy-Sinha statement

[Shri A. K. Dutt]

was made. The proposal was for the advantage of the two States, but the people in their agitated and resentful mood refused to consider it; particularly when they found that in the Bill, no provision had been made for transferring land from Bihar to West Bengal, they got very much frustrated. In this mood, it is very difficult for people of West Bengal to understand the implications of the proposed union. Unless the SRC report as modified by the Cabinet is implemented, it would be difficult for us to clear the atmosphere there. I would appeal to the Home Minister to implement the SRC's suggestion as modified by the Cabinet and thus create a calmer atmosphere so that we could convince the people of both the States that it would be beneficial for both the States to accept the union.

Shri Pocker Saheb (Mallapuram): I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity. It is too late in the day to spend any time in discussing the wisdom or otherwise of this great enterprise upon which we have launched. Anyhow, having begun the game, we have to play it out in such a manner that at least no harm is done to the country in playing this great game.

First of all, I have to point out one matter on which I had expected some clarification from the Home Minister, when he initiated the debate on this motion, and that relates to my own district, namely Malabar.

Under the Bill as it stands, Malabar becomes separated from Madras from 1st October, the appointed day; and it is to become part of the new Kerala State along with the Travancore-Cochin State. The scheme of the Bill is that the Malabar members who represent that district in the present Madras State Legislature shall join the Travancore-Cochin State and become members of the Kerala State Legislature.

But what has happened subsequent to the introduction of the Bill or rather the circulation of the draft Bill is that the Travancore-Cochin State has been taken over by the President and the legislature has been dissolved. So, now, Travancore-Cochin State is being ruled by the President. From 1st October, I would like to know what would happen to Malabar? What will be the administrative structure of Malabar from 1st October? No doubt, when the Bill was framed, such a contingency did not exist.

But having regard to the subsequent events, I had expected that Government would clarify the position as to what Malabar's position would be, what would be the machinery which will govern Malabar, and what will be the status of the legislators representing Malabar in the Madras State.

If it is to be imagined that it will go along with the Travancore-Cochin State under the President's rule, I do not think it will be proper; I do not think that Government would seriously consider such a thing because there is no justification, so far as Malabar is concerned, to take it over under President's rule. The other alternative is that Malabar should remain with the present Madras State, and the appointed day, so far as Malabar is concerned, should be postponed to some other day. In that case, the district of Malabar will have to suffer under the rule of the present Madras State, under which it has been suffering ever since the talk of separation of Malabar started. Before then, there was not so much complaint. But ever since the talk of separation came, Malabar is being treated in a very callous manner by the Madras Government, and therefore, it will have to suffer further. Anyhow, if that is to be the fate of Malabar for some time more, the Madras Government has to be warned that it has to treat Malabar fairly and squarely at least for this temporary period. I am anxious to know what is the policy of Government as regards this question.

I have to refer to one or two other aspects so far as the Bill is concerned. One is that about Gudalur which forms part of Nilgiri district now. The SRC is entirely silent about it, I do not know with what justification, when so much representation has been made to it about the necessity of its being included in Kerala. A very large majority of the population of that area speak Malayalam, and they have made very strong representations that they should be included in Kerala. But that was entirely ignored by the Commission. I do submit that Government should have included Gudalur in Kerala State in this Bill.

The other matter is the much-talked of question of the southern districts of Travancore-Cochin. I do not want to take the time of the House by dwelling on the merits of that question, because it is well known that it has been part

of T.C. State all along and the Tamil movement was only a creation of very recent years when Dr. C. P. Ramaswamy Iyer was the Diwan of Travancore. It is all a political game and nothing else. If at all that question is to be decided, it can easily be decided by having a plebiscite in that particular area. It will then be found that they really are anxious to remain in Kerala State.

One other matter which I would like to refer to in this connection is the question of the islands—Laccadive, Minicoy and Amini islands. These islands are isolated and are a few hundred miles away from the mainland. A peculiar feature of these islands is that no law of the mainland applies to them except Regulation I of 1912. They have no facilities for education, medical relief or anything. They are cut-off. They have been looking to the mainland always for help. It is very rarely they get the needed help whenever they require it. Somehow, under the Constitution, as it stands, they have got the right of being represented by their elected representatives. They are being deprived of that and they are to be put directly under the Centre. I submit that this is not quite just to the people of those islands. Of course, if they are governed better by the Centre, it should be their luck and I shall be very glad. But, at the same time, that they should be deprived of the privileges they possess now, is really a grave injustice.

During the short time that I have, I will refer to a few other points. One is about the necessity for a common High Court. If High Courts are created separately for each of the small States, they will command much lesser respect than the High Courts now command. I find that the people of Malabar will have to come under the jurisdiction of a High Court which is lesser in status than the present High Court of Madras. According to the constitution of the High Courts under this Bill, the High Court for Kerala will be of a lower status (*Interruption*). It is not a question of raising the salaries. The salaries determine the status. It is a question how far you can afford to raise the salaries. You can easily say that they can be raised. In order to keep united the contiguous States and in order to keep up the dignity of these High Courts, it is necessary and advisable that a common High Court should be maintained both for Kerala and Madras States. I think the Travancore-Cochin State will have no

objection. In this connection, I would like Government to take the opinion of the High Courts concerned rather than depend on the opinion of laymen.

One other matter which I would like to refer to is about the constitution of Zonal Councils. Of course, that is an experiment and I welcome it very much. But, even at this experimental stage, we should see that they consist of some elected representatives also from the Legislatures of the States composing the zone.

श्री हेम राज (कांगडा) : सभानेत्री महोदय, मैं आपको धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया।

जिस समय स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन (राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग) की रिपोर्ट देश में भ्रायी इसमें शक नहीं कि उस समय देश का वायुमंडल बहुत उत्तेजित हुआ और देश में बहुत जोश पैदा हुआ और उसकी वजह से कुछ ऐसे वाक्यात भी हो गये जिनकी वजह से हमारे देश को शर्मसार होना पड़ा और बाहर के देशों में भी हमें बदनामी का टीका लगने का खतरा पैदा हो गया। लेकिन हमारे देश के नेताओं ने पुरखमन तरीके से सारी उलझनों को सुलझाया जिसका नतीजा यह है कि आज वह जोश व खरोश नहीं रहा और देश के दुस्मन जो यह चाह रहे थे कि देश में एक जबरदस्त खानाजंगी (गृह युद्ध) शुरू हो जायेगी उनको मायूसी उठानी पड़ी।

5 P.M.

इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि हमारे गृह मंत्री पंडित गोविंद वल्लभ पंत ने बहुत ही योग्यता से अपने कर्तव्य का पालन किया है और देश के लोगों में यह विश्वास जम गया है कि उनके रहते देशवासियों और इस देश का कोई अहित नहीं होगा। लोगों को उनमें इतना भरोसा है कि वे समझते हैं कि उनकी मौजूदगी में देश में किसी क्रिस्म की भी खराबी नहीं हो सकती और उनकी योग्यता का इस बात से अंदाजा लगाया जा सकता है कि पेचीदा से पेचीदा मसले को वह बड़ी खूबसूरती से हल कर लेते हैं। काश्मीर के मुताल्लिक उन्होंने जो स्टेटमेंट (वक्तव्य) निकाला उसका देश भर की जनता ने स्वागत किया और देशवासियों के दिलों में एक जोश की लहर उठ खड़ी हुई। यह जो स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन का बिल उन्होंने हमारे सामने पेश किया है, वह उनके तद्वर, बुद्धिवादी और क्रांतिलयित

[श्री हेम राज]

का नतीजा है। यह बिल जो उन्होंने आज पेश किया है यह जनता की जो आवाज है उसको सामने रख कर बनाया गया है और उसके साथ ही जो उसूल स्टेट्स रिआरगैनाइजेशन कमीशन ने अपने सामने रखे थे, उनको मद्देनजर रख कर एक बहुत ही अच्छा और माकूल हल इस पेचीदा मामले का उन्होंने देश के सामने पेश किया है।

इस बिल में जो जोनल कौंसिलों की स्थापना का सुझाव है वह बहुत ही माकूल है और स्वागत योग्य चीज है। विशेष कर जैसा कि हमारे माननीय नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने भी बतलाया था कि ऐसी स्टेट्स जो कि सरहद पर स्थित हों और जो कि १५०० मील से लम्बी हों वहाँ पर इस तरह की जोनल कौंसिल का होना बहुत ही मुनासिब है, जैसे पंजाब, पेंसू, हिमाचल प्रदेश, दिल्ली तथा जम्मू और काश्मीर प्रदेशों की एक जोनल कौंसिल बनाना निहायत जरूरी है क्योंकि जो बार्डर स्टेट्स (सीमान्त राज्य) हैं, वह लाजिमी तौर पर बहुत अच्छी हालत में और काफ़ी मजबूत होनी चाहियें।

जोनल कौंसिलों की स्थापना के साथ ही साथ हम इस हाउस में एक इंटर स्टेट रिवर डिसप्यूट्स बिल (अन्तः राज्य नदी विवाद विधेयक) और एक रिवर बोर्ड बिल (नदी बोर्ड विधेयक) ला रहे हैं जिसका कि ताल्लुक उन सारी स्टेट्स और इंडस बेसिन (सिन्धु घाटी) से पड़ेगा जहाँ कि यह तीनों चारों नदियां मसलन्, सतलुज, व्यास, रावी और चेनाब हो कर बहती हैं और फायदा पहुंचाती हैं, में चाहता हूँ कि इस किस्म के मामलात भी जोनल कौंसिल के सुपुर्दे होने चाहियें और वे जो भी इन के सम्बन्ध में फ़ैसला करेंगे, वह सारी चीजों की छानवीन करने के बाद करेंगे, इसलिये उनका जो फ़ैसला होगा वह माकूल होगा और सबको मान्य होने की आशा है।

इस राज्य पुनर्गठन बिल के जरिये काफ़ी धन की बचत होने वाली है और जो नई स्टेट्स बनने वाली हैं उनके बजट में आने से पांच गवर्नर कम हो जायेंगे, दो लेफ्टिनेंट गवर्नर कम हो जायेंगे, तीन जूडिशल कमिश्नर्स हट जायेंगे और चार हाईकोर्ट्स एबालिश् (समाप्त) हो जायेंगे। इसके अतिरिक्त राज्यप्रमुख का पद समाप्त करने के लिये जो जनता तीव्र आन्दोलन कर रही थी, उस राज्यप्रमुख के सिस्टम को भी

आपने खत्म कर दिया है और इस तरह भी काफ़ी धन की बचत की है। ६ पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन (लोक सेवा आयोग) कम हो जायेंगे।

मैं पंजाब की पेचीदा समस्या को सफलतापूर्वक और योग्यतापूर्वक सुलझाने के लिये आपको विशेष तौर पर बधाई देना चाहता हूँ। पंजाब का मसला बहुत ही उलझन में पड़ा हुआ था और बार्डर स्टेट होने की वजह से पंजाब का सवाल काफ़ी अहमियत रखता था और उसको जिस खूबसूरती के साथ हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने सुलझाया है, उसके लिये सारा देश उनका आभारी रहेगा। अभी हमारे रामराज्य परिषद् के एक भाई कह रहे थे कि पंजाब में इससे वायुमंडल खराब हो गया है, मैं कहता हूँ कि यह बिलकूल गलत बात है। पंजाब में जितनी पार्टीज हैं, काँग्रेस, सोशलिस्ट पार्टी, अकाली पार्टी और आर्यसमाज आदि जितनी भी पार्टियां हैं, वे समझती हैं कि पंजाब की समस्या को ठीक तरीक़े से हल किया गया है और वह पंजाब के निवासियों और देश के हित में है। इसके साथ ही मैं यह भी समझता हूँ कि इसके द्वारा जो दो हिस्सों में एक दूसरे के खिलाफ़ मतभेद चला आ रहा था, वह खत्म हो गया है और आज सारे पंजाब के लोगों में एक आपसी मेलमिलाप और भाईचारे का वातावरण पैदा हो गया है। हमारे ज्ञानी करतार सिंह जो कि अभी तक यह समझते थे कि यह मामला हल नहीं हो सकता और यह जुदा जुदा हो कर रहेंगे, वह इसको ठीक और माकूल हल कह रहे हैं और आज फ़िज़ा यह हो गई है कि मास्टर तारा सिंह जगह जगह इस बात का प्रचार करते फिर रहे हैं कि सिख और हिन्दु भाई भाई हैं और दोनों को मिल कर पंजाब में रहना है और उनमें आपस में भाई भाई का रिश्ता है और आज वे उनके दरमियान किसी किस्म की लड़ाई झगड़े को बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकते। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह आपकी क्राबिलियत का ही नतीजा था कि आपने इस तरीक़े से पंजाब के पेचीदा मामले को हल कर दिया।

इसके साथ ही आपने अपनी तजवीज़ों में रीजनल कमेटोज़ (प्रादेशिक समितियां) सेट अप (स्थापित) करने की बात कही है और आपने उसका नाम पंजाब रीजनल कमेटोज़ रखा है, मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसके मुताल्लिक ज्ञानी करतार सिंह ने पंजाब लेजिस्लेटिव कौंसिल में जो अपने विचार प्रकट किये हैं, उनके अनुसार इनका नाम रीजनल डेवलपमेंट कमेटोज़ रख देना चाहिये। इनका नाम

ईस्टर्न और वेस्टर्न डेवलपमेंट कमेटी होना चाहिये। जानी करतार सिंह ने इसके मुताल्लिक यह कहा है :

“The suggestion that the Regional Committees should be termed as Regional Councils; I wish to submit that the names of these Committees should not connote any spirit of separatism. However, when these Regional Committees are constituted they should give the right to propose the name of the region. In the meantime our Hindu and Sikh brethren should try to find out a suitable name, which may be acceptable to one and all.”

यह बड़ी खुशकिस्मती की बात है कि वे हिन्दुओं और सिक्खों के दरमियान भातुभाव पैदा कर रहे हैं और मैं समझता हूँ कि रीजनल डेवलपमेंट कमेटियों के पीछे यही भावना काम कर रही है कि हिन्दुओं और सिक्खों में मेलमिलाप कायम किया जाय और जो कोई भी उनके बीच मतभेद विद्यमान हो, इनके जरिये मिटाया जाय और हिन्दुओं और सिक्खों में भाई भाई का सा रिश्ता कायम हो जाय। लेकिन इस के साथ ही मैं एक बात आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ और वह जो पहाड़ी एरियाज हैं उन से ताल्लुक रखती है। जो हमारे पहाड़ी एरियाज हैं जिन में कांगड़ा डिस्ट्रिक्ट है, पठानकोट तहसील है, होशियारपुर की मुकूरियां सब-तहसील है, उसा और पेप्सू का कंडा घाट हैं उन के जो भी मामलात है, चाहे खेती के, चाहे इरिगेशन (सिंचाई) के या जंगलात के, वह सब प्लेन (मैदानी क्षेत्र) के मामलात से मुस्तलिफ हैं। अगर आप हकीकी तौर पर हिल रीजन (पहाड़ी क्षेत्रों) को डेवलप (विकसित) करना चाहते हैं, जैसा कि आप को चाहिये, पंजाब की जो लेजिस्लेटिव ऐसेम्बली है, उस ने भी कहा है कि वह हकीकी तौर पर हिल रीजन को डेवलप करना चाहती है, तो आप को इस के लिये एक तीसरी रीजनल कमेटी कायम करनी चाहिये। हिल्स को डेवलप करने का यही एक वाजिह तरीका हो सकता है।

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

इस वास्ते मैं यह चीज आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। जो हमारी पंजाब की विधान सभा के मेम्बरान उन इलाकों से हैं उन्होंने भी गृह मंत्री महोदय को एक मेमोरैण्डम (जापन) दिया है। हमारे इलाके की जो पब्लिक है,

उस की भी यही डिमान्ड है। इस लिये मुझे उम्मीद है कि हमारे गृह मंत्री जी इस डिमान्ड पर लाजिमी तौर पर ध्यान देंगे और पंजाब के लिये एक तीसरी रीजनल कमेटी भी रखेंगे।

इस के अलावा मैं आप से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप ने जो पहले बिल भेजा था हमारे यहाँ की विधान सभा को उस में आप ने लिखा था :

“Ultimately Himachal Pradesh will be integrated with Punjab.”

यानी किसी न किसी समय हिमाचल प्रदेश पंजाब के साथ शामिल हो जायेगा। हिमाचल प्रदेश की जनता में जो भय काम कर रहा है वह यह है कि अगर वह पंजाब के साथ शामिल हो गये तो जो उन के हकूक हैं पंजाब के लोग गासिब हो जायेंगे और उन को हड़प कर जायेंगे। उन के दिलों के अन्दर आज यह डर काफी समाया हुआ है। लेकिन अगर पहाड़ी रीजन बना दी जाये तो उन लोगों का डर कम हो जायेगा और मैं नहीं समझता कि जो हिमाचल प्रदेश के लोग हैं वे बहुत दिनों तक अपने को पंजाब से अलग रखेंगे। जो तीसरी रीजनल कमेटी होगी उस में वह शामिल हो जायेंगे। मैं ने कई दफा उन भाइयों से बातचीत करने की कोशिश की है, उन का यह खयाल है कि तीसरी रीजनल कमेटी बन जाने पर वह उस में शामिल हो जायेंगे तो कोई असर उन के हकूक पर नहीं पड़ेगा।

एक और चीज जो इस बिल के अन्दर रक्खी गई है वह यह है कि दो या तीन स्टेट्स के लिये एक हाई कोर्ट हो सकेगा। जहाँ तक पंजाब और पेप्सू के हाई कोर्ट्स का ताल्लुक है, वहाँ पर आप ने यह चीज नहीं रक्खी कि जो पेप्सू हाई कोर्ट के जजेज होंगे उन को पंजाब के हाई-कोर्ट में जज कर लिया जायेगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि पेप्सू जो कि अब तक एक अलग स्टेट रही है, और जिसने इतनी कुर्बानी की है कि वह पंजाब में शामिल हो रही है तो उस के जजेज को मौका देना चाहिये कि वह पंजाब हाई कोर्ट के अन्दर जज्व किये जा सकें। जैसे आप ने पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन के बारे में एक प्राविजन (उपबन्ध) किया है धारा ११० में कि जो पेप्सू पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन के मेम्बर होंगे वह पंजाब पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन के मेम्बर बन जायेंगे, इसी तरह से इस मामले

[श्री. हेम राज]

में भी आप्र को करना चाहिये था। लेकिन आप ने हाई कोर्ट्स के मामल म कोई इस किस्म का विजन नहीं रक्खा है। म चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह का प्राविजन इस में अभी से कर दिया जाये।

आपने जो जोनल कौंसिल रक्खी है उस में यह प्राविजन किया जाये कि आल इंडिया सर्विस के कर्मचारी जोनल कौंसिल की स्टेट्स में कहीं पर भी लगाये जा सकने तक हमारे दम्यान जो करप्शन (भ्रष्टाचार) आज चलता है या फेवरिडिज्म चलता है, वह खत्म हो सके। मैं समझता हूँ कि आप के ऐसा करने से हमारे ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन (प्रशासन) में जो खराबियाँ आज पैदा हो गई हैं वह दूर हो जायेंगी।

मैं अब एक और बात आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ, और वह यह है कि पंजाबी रीजन में भाषा के सम्बन्ध में एक विषमता चलती रही है। इस हद् तक तो दीगर बात हुई कि कोई भी लड़का जो दसवीं पास करेगा, उस को लाजिमी तौर पर दसवीं जमात में दो भाषाओं में इम्तहान देना पड़ेगा। एक पंजाबी में और दूसरा हिन्दी में। इस तरह से मैं समझता हूँ कि पहले भाषा के सम्बन्ध में जो विषमता थी वह दूर हो जायेगी, लेकिन एक बात का झगड़ा जो हिन्दुओं के दम्यान चल रहा है और जिसकी वजह से पंजाबी रीजन में एक नाराजगी पाई जाती है वह यह है कि हर आदमी को मजबूर किया जाये कि अगर कोई पंजाबी रीजन में रहता है और वह हिन्दी जानते हुए हिन्दी में दख्खिस्त देना चाहता है किसी अदालत में, तो वह गुरुमुखी में दे। अगर उन को इस हद् तक छूट दे दी जाये कि अदालतों में वह हिन्दी में दख्खिस्त देना चाहें तो उन को मजबूर न किया जायेगा कि वह गुरुमुखी में दें, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि जो बहुत सारी विषमतायें हैं और हिन्दुओं के दिल में यह खयाल पैदा हो गया है कि उन के ऊपर कोई चीज ठूँसी जा रही है, वह खत्म हो जायेगा और प्रेम का वायूमंडल जो आज पैदा हो गया है, वह बढ़ता जायेगा। जितनी भी मुस्तलिफ पार्टियाँ हैं, सब ने इस का समर्थन किया है।

इन शब्दों के साथ जो बिल यहाँ पेश हुआ है उस के लिये मैं श्री पंत जी को मुबारकबाद देता हूँ और इस को सपोर्ट करता हूँ।

Shri Mathew (Kottayam): Till some-time ago this afternoon I had no idea of participating in the debate today, but

when I listened to the speech of my friend Shri Vallatharas I thought I should make a few comments. He was refreshingly frank on one point. He referred to what was once in the air—the proposal of a merger between the proposed Kerala State and the Madras State. Now, it has been left in the background and there is no reference to it in the present Bill. Yet he thought it worth-while and necessary to refer to that proposal and to object to it very forcibly. Once again let me say I am very much appreciative of the frankness with which he spoke.

What was his main ground of objection? Generally, the minority is apprehensive of the possibility of unfair treatment at the hands of the majority. But in this case it is not so. The people of Kerala will remain in a minority always in the big State, if the merger comes into existence at any time. But Shri Vallatharas said, frankly enough, that even in the present Madras State there are far too many Malayalees in the services; and it will be far worse in a Kerala-Madras State. I do not know the facts, I have not got the statistics. But I fail to see why there should be this apprehension on the part of the big majority *i.e.* on the part of the citizens of the Madras State. Why should there be any scope for—if I may frankly say—this inferiority complex? I for my part have no corresponding consciousness of any superior talents and intelligence of the people of Kerala. We are just on the same footing as our Tamil friends.

So I do not think there is any need for apprehension, at any rate on the part of the majority community. Leaving aside this fear as unnecessary, unfounded and baseless, I wish to say that the main positive reason in favour of such a merger, though it is not now before the House, is the obvious advantage of an economic character. I need not go into details, but it will be fairly obvious to everyone that a merger between the proposed Kerala State and the Madras State at some time in the future will be to the economic advantage of both and in the light of this, every other consideration should be allowed to lapse into the background.

I do not want to dwell upon the political advantage of such a merger, but I only want to refer to that in passing and say that a bigger State than either the Madras State or the Kerala State by itself would certainly be to the political

advantage of the two States that are merged together. I need not adduce arguments. In certain matters we can safely go by the verdict of our ablest statesmen. One of the ablest statesmen in the whole of India is Shri Rajagopalachari and in the most unmistakable way he has pleaded for this merger, deeply convinced of its advantages. As the Finance Minister of the Madras State put it very recently, though the proposal is now not before the country, it is to be hoped that at a time not in the distant future this idea will be revived, and freed of all suspicion the people in both the States will view it in the proper light and perspective and realise the obvious advantages for all concerned. I am in entire agreement with him in entertaining these hopes.

Incidentally, my friend Shri Vallatharas referred to the question of Devicolam and Peermede. I thought that the question had been once for all taken as decided. The Commission itself went into the matter very fully and if that was not enough, in the discussion in December last on the floor of this House, that question was thrashed out fully. I thought it was taken as settled once for all, but my friend thought it worthwhile or necessary once again to refer to that. Here again I do not want to enter into details. As was said by a friend here, the removal of the southern taluks is something like cutting off the feet of the Travancore-Cochin or Kerala State. If Devicolam and Peermede were to be taken away, economically it will be chopping off the head of that State as it were. Anyhow, no one seriously entertains such an idea at present. There are things for which we, the people of Kerala, pleaded before passionately, hardly any of them has been conceded; yet, we have to take certain things as settled facts as it were. Therefore, for my part I do not think it useful again to raise the question of the southern taluks of our State. As I said, certain things decided on after thorough arguments have been adduced on either side have to be taken as accomplished facts with all their limitations. Therefore, the proposals in the Bill on the whole, in the context of the present situation are fairly reasonable and satisfactory and I would heartily support the motion for referring the Bill to a Joint Committee.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore): Mr. Speaker, while welcoming this Bill, let me pay my sincere tribute to the Government, more especially to the hon.

Home Minister and the Prime Minister, for having conducted the affairs in regard to this States reorganisation with admirable statesmanship and also with courage. They had to wade through difficult times and amidst situations created by linguistic passions and prejudices which blinded some of the statesmen in several parts of the country. I am sure they have proceeded at times very boldly though they receded very adroitly at some other times. Of course, they conceded generously and later on, they succeeded very admirably. Having created zonal bodies, they have solved to a great extent the possibility of constant squabbles between State and State. There will be every possibility hereafter, when these zonal bodies are constituted, for the several States to come together and agree upon certain things on which there have been longstanding differences of opinion. I do not want to mention anything about the other States as I do not want to tread upon others' toes. I would concentrate on certain aspects of the Andhra State as it has been constituted.

While the Andhra State appreciates the final settlement of the disputes between Telangana and Andhra, they have been showing restlessness with regard to the three taluks in Bellary district, namely, Bellary, Siruguppa and Hospet. You may remember that the hon. Prime Minister, in the month of January or so, made a statement that the future of Bellary and the other two taluks will be settled by mutual agreement between the Andhra and Mysore States. Unfortunately, agreement has not been arrived at and the Chief Minister of the Andhra State seems to have said openly in the Andhra Assembly that no such agreement has been possible. About 75 members of Telangana in the Hyderabad Assembly have signed and issued a statement commending the conclusion that was come to by the States Reorganisation Commission, namely, that Bellary and the two other taluks should be taken over by Andhra. The hon. Prime Minister has been very carefully suggesting to this House that the method of reorganisation of States would be more to satisfy administrative convenience rather linguistic adjustments. When that is so, Bellary and the other two taluks have been recommended by the S.R.C. to be placed in the Andhra State. If the linguistic principle is commended to a larger extent, Kolar must go to Andhra, if Bellary and other places are ceded to Mysore. In these circumstances, I

[Shri Ramachandra Reddi]

would request the hon. Home Minister and the entire Government to see that this matter is reconsidered and Bellary and the two other taluks, are given to the Andhra State for the purpose of good administration and for the convenience of Rayalaseema which is sought to be improved and developed and helped by the Tungabhadra project. It might be said, as has already been pointed out by the Home Minister this morning, that sufficient arrangements are made for the development of the Tungabhadra project. The Andhra State does not seem to have been satisfied with these arrangements, because they have passed a resolution recently. We find in page 73 of the resume of the discussions of the Andhra Assembly this resolution :

"This House strongly urges on the Government of India and the Parliament to reconsider the case of the areas of Bellary district proposed by the States Reorganisation Commission to be transferred from the Mysore State to the State of Andhra and to add the said territories to the State of Andhra as

from the appointed date under clause 3 of the States Reorganisation Bill."

I need not point out that there is a background behind this resolution which is vastly convincing. As early as 1953, about 86 members of the Madras Assembly who were Andhras had issued a statement categorically stating the need for keeping Bellary under Andhra and not under Mysore. I have no personal quarrel with Mysore at all, if they think of having linguistic contiguity.....

Shri K. K. Basu: It is 5-30 P.M. now. Can the hon. Member not continue his speech tomorrow morning?

Mr. Speaker: All right. The hon. Member may continue his speech tomorrow.

5-31 P.M.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Half Past Ten of the Clock on Tuesday the 24th April 1956.